NEW SERIES *Price 75cts.* VOL. VIII No. 4

PROCEEDINGS of the VERMONT *Historical Society*

Seth Warner
Ethan Allen. *A Review*
Vermont's Part in Industry
The Rise and Decline of the Iron Industry in the Eastern Adirondack Region. *An Abstract*
Postscript

PUBLISHED BY THE SOCIETY
DECEMBER
1940

OFFICERS OF THE VERMONT HISTORICAL SOCIETY

President

Leon S. Gay, Cavendish, Vt.

Vice-Presidents

Mortimer R. Proctor, Proctor, Vt.
Dorman B. E. Kent, Montpelier, Vt.
Elbert S. Brigham, Montpelier, Vt.
Curtis R. Smith, St. Albans, Vt.

Secretary

Phil S. Howes, Montpelier, Vt.

Treasurer

F. Whitney Harrington, Montpelier, Vt.

Board of Directors

Harold G. Rugg, Hanover, N. H.
John Clement, Rutland, Vt.
Walter R. Hard, Manchester, Vt.
John Spargo, Bennington, Vt.
Rawson C. Myrick, Montpelier, Vt.
Benjamin Gates, Montpelier, Vt.
Harrison J. Conant, Montpelier, Vt.
Leon S. Gay, *ex officio*
Phil S. Howes, *ex officio*
F. Whitney Harrington, *ex officio*

Librarian and Curator

Edward A. Hoyt

Assistant

Agnes K. Lawson

Editor of the *Proceedings*

Arthur Wallace Peach
6 Prospect Street
Northfield, Vt.

Proceedings

of the

VERMONT

Historical Society

DECEMBER

1940

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SETH WARNER 325
By *Walter S. Fenton, Esq.*

ETHAN ALLEN. *A Review* 351
By *John Clement*

VERMONT'S PART IN INDUSTRY 357
By *Ralph W. Putnam*

THE RISE AND DECLINE OF THE IRON INDUSTRY IN THE EASTERN ADIRONDACK REGION. *An Abstract* 374
By *Elmer Eugene Barker, Ph.D.*

POSTSCRIPT 377

Among the articles which we shall have the pleasure of publishing in coming issues of the *Proceedings* are contributions by Professor Ray Nash of Dartmouth College on the early teachers of writing in the state, by Professor Herbert E. Putnam of the University of Vermont on population changes since the first census, by Mr. John H. Bailey on recent archaeological research in the Lake Champlain valley.

Copyright, 1940, *by* VERMONT HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Printed and made in the United States of America by E. L. Hildreth & Company, Inc.
Publication Office: 8 Harmony Place, Brattleboro, Vermont.
$3.00 A Year Published Quarterly 75 Cents A Copy
GENERAL OFFICE: MONTPELIER, VT.
Entered as second-class matter December 23, 1937, at the post office at Brattleboro, Vermont, under the Act of August 24, 1912.

PVHS

Proceedings of the
Vermont Historical Society

1940

NEW SERIES DECEMBER VOL. VIII No. 4

SETH WARNER

By WALTER S. FENTON, ESQ.

For many years Seth Warner has been a shadowy figure in Vermont history, and it is probably true, as a partial reason, that the colorful Ethan Allen has appealed more to the imagination of Vermonters. We believe that both men were vital assets to Vermont in the dangerous, doubtful years of the state's formation, and that each, without comparisons detrimental to the other, deserves recognition among other heroic lives of Vermont's past. Ethan Allen received his recognition early; Seth Warner has been in recent years coming to his own. This address which, we trust, you are about to read, by the late Walter S. Fenton of Rutland, Vermont, is part of that story. He delivered the address at the dedication of a granite marker at the beginning of the Seth Warner Memorial Highway in Cornwall, just outside of Middlebury village. This dedication was held under the auspices of the Daughters of the American Revolution. The same address, with the exception of the introduction, was given at Isle La Motte on the occasion of an "Old Home Day" August 22, 1935. In this address the introduction dealt with Warner's relation to the early history of Isle La Motte. We are following the text of the address delivered on May 24, 1934. We think this excellent summation of Warner's life and achievements merits preservation not only because it represents competent historical study, but also because it is Mr. Fenton's last contribution to Vermont historical research. A lawyer of ability and high professional standing, he belonged to the small but notable group of Vermont professional men whose interest

in the state's history has led and is leading to the writing of distinctive pages in Vermont annals of the past. The Editor.

I CAN think of nothing that could give me more genuine pleasure than to be permitted to participate in the exercises attendant upon the dedication of this marker, designed as a lasting memorial to one who deserves so much from the state which he so effectively helped to establish.

The legislature of 1933 is indeed to be most heartily congratulated by every true lover of our state in publicly recognizing, in the name and behalf of the people of Vermont, his distinguished and invaluable services.

The Joint Resolution, by which this highway is hereafter to be known and called the "Seth Warner Memorial Highway" fittingly sets forth that

> *the people of Vermont hold in grateful remembrance the name of SETH WARNER, conspicuous leader in the early land title controversies of the New Hampshire Grants, captor of Crown Point, Colonel of the Regiment of "Green Mountain Boys" in the Continental Army, veteran of the Canadian Campaign under Montgomery, victor at Longueil, commander at Hubbardton, whose assistance to Stark assured success at Bennington, distinguished citizen, loyal patriot and outstanding military leader.*

Such is the great character whom it is our privilege to honor to-day, through the generous and patriotic action of the Daughters of the American Revolution in providing this splendid marker as the first step in suitably designating this memorial highway.

It is unfortunate, but nevertheless altogether too true, that we have been extremely remiss in the past in our recognition of Seth Warner's proper place in Vermont's Hall of Fame. While we have paid tribute to other of our early heroes, and justly so, Warner seems always to have been kept more or less in the background.

One does not realize this until he has occasion to investigate the subject. All of us know in a general way that he was a more or less prominent figure in the early controversy over the land grants, and when we have occasion to refer to that period, his name is usually mentioned along with many others who took part in those events.

But when one makes a serious study of the history of the New Hampshire Grants and Vermont's participation in the Revolutionary War, as I did when asked to give an address at the Sesquicentennial of the Battle of Hubbardton in 1927, it is made most glaringly evident that Vermont has given altogether too little consideration to Seth Warner and the magnificence of the service which he rendered her in her infancy and time of need.

I found that others had likewise reached a similar conclusion; that Daniel Chipman, who, as a small boy, had known Warner, had discovered the same situation; that it was emphatically impressed on George F. Houghton who delivered an address on Seth Warner before the Historical Society in 1848; that the late Olin Scott of Bennington, from his own funds, had provided and presented to the state in 1911 a monument surmounted by a statue of Warner, erected on the hill near the Bennington Battle Monument, to the end that Warner might have some recognition.

Some years later I learned that a former Vermonter, Mr. T. W. Kirkland, now of Holyoke, Massachusetts, had been devoting a great deal of time and effort to and had made an extensive study of Warner's connection with the early history of Vermont, and his article, "The Man Who Did Things Without Talking," is a valuable and extremely interesting contribution to the subject.

So it is particularly gratifying to me that we gather here to-day, once more to honor the memory of this illustrious patriot. May the time be not far distant when there may be placed upon the portico of the Capitol at Montpelier an heroic statue of Seth Warner, to balance that of his great compatriot, Ethan Allen, by whose side he was so often found in the early struggles of our state!

On the 6th day of May, 1743 (old style, May 17th, new style), there was born in the Parish of Roxbury, in the Township of Woodbury, Connecticut, Seth Warner, destined to become an outstanding participant in the pre-Revolutionary activities in the New Hampshire Grants, and, during the War of Independence, to be Vermont's unquestioned military leader.

His ancestry can be traced backward through five generations in America to John Warner, of Farmington, who died in 1678 or 1679. Seth Warner was the fourth of ten children of Dr. Benjamin Warner, who, in turn, was the third of ten children of Ebenezer Warner, and the grandson of Dr. Ebenezer Warner.

Evidently the Warner family were attracted to the practice of

medicine, as two of the brothers of Seth emulated their father and great-grandfather in following this profession, while Seth in his early days became a skillful botanist and was exceedingly proficient in the preparation of various native herbs and roots utilized in the healing art.

His first association with Vermont began in 1765, when he removed, with his father and the other members of the family, to Bennington, in the New Hampshire Grants.

His name does not appear on the muster roll of the military company originally organized in Bennington on October 24, 1764, doubtless because he had not yet arrived in Bennington; but in a census prepared in the latter part of 1765, by Samuel Robinson, of those settled in Bennington prior to June 1st, 1765, will be found the names of Seth Warner and his father, Dr. Benjamin, as well as Daniel Warner, who was either his brother or his cousin, both bearing the same name.

A lover of the out-of-doors, he spent a great deal of time roaming through the forests in search of game, and became a successful hunter, an expert woodsman and thoroughly acquainted with all the territory in the vicinity.

Thus was developed the powerful body, the keen mentality and the strength of character that distinguished him throughout an honorable life.

He was a man of striking physical appearance, as may be well inferred from the following description given by one who, as a boy, had enjoyed his acquaintance:

> A man of iron frame and noble personal appearance, standing not less than six feet and two inches in his stocking feet (one account of him says six feet, three inches and three quarters), he was possessed of great bodily strength and agility. His features were regular and strongly marked and indicated great mental strength and fixedness of purpose; good-natured; of simple, natural manners; free from any kind of affectation; dignified; and distinguished for his cool courage and perfect self-possession on all occasions, and for the entire confidence with which he always inspired his associates and those under his command.

Growing up in the new country, he naturally became much interested when the controversy with New York over the Land Grants

developed, and was a conspicuous leader of the Green Mountain Boys throughout this struggle. Joining with Ethan Allen, who had settled in Bennington in 1769, he became an early and important member of the semi-military organization known as the "Green Mountain Boys," in 1771 being made captain of one of the companies then formed. One cannot investigate original sources without becoming impressed with the fact that wherever any activity was carried on in controversies with New York grantees or those claiming to act under the authority of New York, Warner is found playing a leading part—always with courage, and without ostentation.

Living but a short distance from the New York line, Warner's reputation for courage and the ability to care for himself was such that the Yorkers religiously refrained from interfering with him, although for some years, in common with Allen, Baker, Cochran and others, he had been outlawed and a price set upon his head.

Although it has been suggested by some that Warner was at the head of the party who rescued Remember Baker from Squire Munro's posse in March, 1772, there is no basis for this assumption. Baker was rescued by a group from Bennington whose names can be found in an article in the *Rural Magazine* for August, 1795, and in which Warner is not included.

However, shortly thereafter, Warner, accompanied by a friend, rode to Munro's house, and there demanded of him Baker's gun which had not been recaptured with its owner. Munro refused to deliver it, and seizing Warner's horse by the bridle called on the constable and several bystanders to arrest him. Warner immediately drew his cutlass and struck Munro over the head, knocking him to the ground, and then rode off. For this act Governor Tryon barred Warner as an emissary of the New Hampshire Grants in negotiations looking toward a settlement of the existing disputes, because as Tryon said, his "audacious behavior to a civil magistrate has subjected him to the penalties of the laws of the country." The Green Mountain Boys, however, took a different view of it, for on May 4, 1773, the proprietors of Poultney presented Warner with a pitch of one hundred acres of land in that township, "for his valor in cutting the head of Esquire Munro the Yorkite." In an address at the Centennial celebration at Poultney in 1861, Henry Clark, referring to this incident, makes a curious error in quoting the vote as "for the vallor of cutting the timber of Esq. Munro."

Warner was one of the judges who sat in the judgment seat to

try the accusations against one Benjamin Spencer of Durham (Clarendon) on November 20, 1773. The judges were themselves the accusers, and naturally (and unquestionably with great propriety according to the then prevailing ideas of justice), he was found guilty. Sentence was passed that his house was a nuisance and should be burned to the ground. The wise counsel of Warner, who seemed endowed with more humanitarian instincts than some of the others, prevailed, and his suggestion was adopted that the house should not be wholly destroyed, but only the roof should be taken off and that might be replaced provided Spencer would declare that it was put on again under the New Hampshire title, and would purchase a right under the charter of that province.

It was Warner, with Remember Baker, who instigated the proceedings against Jacob Marsh, a New York grantee of lands in Socialboro (Rutland and Pittsford). Baker insisted upon the application of the "beech seal" as a punishment, but again Warner prevailed on the judges to mete out less drastic penalties. Mercy was not extended, however, in the case of Benjamin Hough, who had been personally more active in seeking the downfall of the New Hampshire Grantees, being instrumental in the passage of the New York legislation outlawing Warner, Baker, Allen and others as well as the act for hanging them without trial. Being convicted, he was sentenced "to be tied to a tree and receive two hundred lashes on the naked back, and then as soon as he should be able, should depart . . . and not return again . . . on pain of receiving five hundred lashes."

This sentence was put in execution with great severity, and Hough was sent on his way with a certificate signed by Allen and Warner showing receipt of the full punishment for his crimes.

Warner was with the party who convicted the Surveyor Cockburn at Holton, destroyed his instruments and banished him from the territory; and he participated in the destruction of the settlement of Col. John Reid at Panton and New Haven in August, 1773, when the houses were burned, the mill dismantled and the mill stones broken.

Time does not permit a more detailed recital of the many occasions which can be found in the record where Warner played a conspicuous and honorable part.

At the outbreak of the war, he was associated in the attack upon Ticonderoga, and, although not in the party which accomplished its capture, he was left in command when the scarcity of boats prevented the transportation of all but about eighty across the Lake.

However, the next morning he was placed in charge of the group who captured Crown Point the next day but one thereafter.

Subsequently, he accompanied Allen to the Continental Congress, for the purpose of obtaining pay for the Green Mountain Boys engaged in the Ticonderoga expedition, and with Allen successfully urged upon Congress the formation of a regiment in Vermont, under the authority of the New York Provincial Congress, with the right to elect its own officers, except field officers, who were to be appointed by the authority of New York.

Naturally, it was the intention of Allen that he should command this regiment, with Warner as his next in rank, and he submitted a list of officers with his own name as Colonel. However, when the Convention of Committees of the several townships of the New Hampshire Grants came to elect its officers on July 27, 1775, notwithstanding Allen was an active candidate, Seth Warner, then thirty-two years of age, was recommended to the command of the regiment by the overwhelming vote of 41 to 5.

No better evidence could be adduced to demonstrate Warner's preeminence for military leadership than the action taken by the Convention in this respect, when it is considered that its membership was well acquainted with the characteristics of both Allen and Warner and appreciated both their good qualities and their weaknesses, as well as their respective fitness for the particular tasks which lay ahead.

That Warner's selection caused more or less controversy among some of the interested parties is clearly apparent. Allen was much disgruntled and charged it to the "old men" in the Convention, "who did not want to go to war."

The correspondence of General Schuyler with the New York Provincial Congress concerning this matter is very interesting.

On July 28th, 1775, Nathan Clark, as Chairman of the Convention of the Committees of the several townships on the New Hampshire Grants, notified General Schuyler of the action taken by the Convention.

In forwarding this communication to the New York Congress on July 31st, Schuyler wrote from Ticonderoga:

> *I am apprehensive, that the controversy, that has arisen amongst them, relative to Field Officers, will cause delay in the levies.*
>
> *Whilst at New York, and even after my arrival here, on*

conversing with Allen and Warner, I did not conceive there would have been any contest between them.

Then began a game of "passing the buck." Apparently neither the New York Congress nor Schuyler wished to be projected into the "controversy," or to assume responsibility for the appointment.

On August 17, 1775, the Congress, acknowledging Schuyler's letter of July 31st, wrote him:

> *The Field Officers were to be recommended jointly with you by this Congress, but as we are ignorant of the merits and qualifications of those among them who would be equal to the appointment, we have therefore concluded to leave the appointment to you. The disputes already subsisting amongst their Chiefs, the principles whereof we are strangers to is an additional inducement in determining as to this reference. Your acquaintance with them we hope will enable you to fix the choice on such persons as may be least exceptionable and who will most effectually promote the service.*

In the meantime on August 20th Schuyler wrote the Congress:

> *Reports prevail that the controversy between Allen and Warner is carried to such length, that few men will be raised and that of these, that may enlist very few will have arms.*

And on August 23rd he wrote again, advising that Warner had been at Ticonderoga that day for the "cloathing" and blankets, adding:

> *I did not mention to him your resolution authorizing me to appoint Field Officers, as I can not possibly comply with that requisition. The peculiar situation of these people and the controversy they have had with this colony or with gentlemen in it, renders that matter too delicate for me to determine and it was in this view, that I begged, that the warrants for the Field Officers might be sent me compleat, which I shall hope to receive as soon as possible.*

The matter was settled by the adoption on September 1st, 1775, by the New York Congress of the following:

Resolved, that Seth Warner be appointed Lieutenant Colonel of the Regiment of Green Mountain Boys, and Resolved, that Samuel Safford be appointed Major of the said Regiment.

General Schuyler's fears were groundless, for a little past the middle of September, 1775, Warner, with his Green Mountain Boys, had joined Montgomery at St. Johns.

To the great credit of Ethan Allen, although he felt humiliated, chagrined and disappointed at not being selected, as he had expected, to the command, yet so far as I have been able to find, he never entertained, either publicly or privately, any personal feeling against Warner on this account.

Hiland Hall, in his *Early History of Vermont*, has analyzed the reasons which very clearly led the Council of Safety to the action which it took.

Hall, adopting in part the language of Daniel Chipman, says:

> Both Allen and Warner were distinguished leaders in the controversy, but they were different men, and fitted to occupy different positions. The bold and defiant language of Allen in his writings and conversation was well calculated to encourage the timid, confirm the wavering and inspire confidence, and his personal courage cannot be questioned. But his vanity was great, always prompting him to claim at least all the merit he deserved and sometimes rendering his manner overbearing and offensive; and he was not free from rashness and imprudence. Warner, on the other hand, was modest and unassuming. He appeared satisfied with being useful, and manifested little solicitude that his services should be known or appreciated. He was always cool and deliberate, and in his sound judgment, as well as in his energy, resolution and firmness, all classes had the most unlimited confidence. As a military leader he was preferred to Allen. Whatever Allen might have thought on the subject, there is no doubt whatever that the selection of Warner to command the regiment was in accordance with the general feeling of the inhabitants of the New Hampshire Grants. It may also be safely said that the wisdom of their action seems to have been confirmed by subsequent events.

While Isaac Jennings, in *Memorials of a Century* speaking on the same subject, says this:

> Seth Warner, Allen's comrade in so many adventures, and in so much public service, without attempting, perhaps incapable of, rhetorical effects by his tongue and pen, possessed more breadth of character, more prudence and judgment, and yet no less determination and courage, than Allen. When the peculiar occasions for adventurous daring had passed by, Warner rose to a higher degree of respect in the public mind, while Providence appeared to have denied to Allen opportunity for achieving further renown.

Subsequent events demonstrated the wisdom of this choice, for, on September 25th, 1775, Allen, who had been detailed by General Schuyler for propaganda work among the Canadians, was captured by the British in a rash and imprudent attempt to capture Montreal; with the result that during the remaining years of military activity in Vermont, he was detained as a prisoner in England, while Warner repeatedly distinguished himself in the military service, as we shall have occasion to point out.

The members of the Convention were quite evidently acquainted with some of Allen's characteristics, which the General Officers of the Continental Army later came to realize. In writing to General Schuyler on September 20, 1775, General Montgomery lamented:

> *Mr. Allen's imprudence and ambition, which urged him to this affair single handed, when he might have had a considerable reinforcement.*

Reporting to John Hancock on October 15th, General Schuyler wrote:

> *I am very apprehensive of disagreeable consequences arising from Mr. Allen's imprudence. I always dreaded his impatience of subordination; and it was not until after a solemn promise, made me in the presence of several officers, that he would demean himself properly, that I would permit him to attend the army; nor would I have consented then had not his solicitations been backed by several officers.*

The matter came to the personal attention of General Washington who wrote Schuyler on October 26th, as follows:

> *Colonel Allen's misfortune will, I hope, teach a lesson of prudence and subordination to others who may be too ambitious to outshine their general officers, and, regardless of order and duty, rush into enterprises which have unfavorable effects to the publick and are destructive to themselves.*

Although Ethan apparently had no ill-feeling toward Warner on account of his having been preferred, so much cannot be said for his brother, Ira, for, in his *History of Vermont*, written in England in the latter part of the century, he betrayed his animus against Warner, without the slightest basis of fact to support it, at a time when the principal characters were dead and unable to refute it, and in a manner wholly unworthy of one who occupies so high a position in the annals of our state.

After stating that the plan to capture Montreal was the result of a joint arrangement entered into between Colonel Allen, Colonel Brown and Colonel Warner, under which each was to approach Montreal from a different direction and simultaneously attack it, he goes on to say:

> The night proved windy, and Brown and Warner judged it dangerous to attempt crossing the river, and went quietly to rest, without sending any express to Colonel Allen, who apprehended no danger from the wind, therefore crossed the river with his men, at different times, in the few small boats he had in his possession. The conduct of Brown and Warner is hard to be accounted for, on any principles honorable to themselves. We are informed by sacred writ that *the disciples of Jesus Christ disputed among themselves who should be the greatest.*

When one considers that Ethan, in his detailed account of the affair, neither mentions Warner nor suggests an intimation that Warner had any connection with it or any knowledge of it, and that there is not to be found a scrap of evidence associating Warner with it, and when we know that Warner was engaged in a military command under Montgomery, in the pursuit of operations associated with the

siege of St. Johns, one cannot account for Ira Allen's gratuitous assault upon the honorable memory of the dead, except upon the theory that at least in his later years he harbored resentment of Warner's preferment over the claims of brother Ethan.

Warner's command was frequently in conflict with the enemy, but his great achievement in the Canadian Campaign was his repulse of General Carleton at Longueil on October 31, 1775, when Carleton attempted to unite with Colonel McLean and march to the relief of St. Johns. Warner, with about three hundred men, attacked Carleton so effectively that Carleton, with more than twice his numbers, retreated to Montreal, resulting in the capitulation of St. Johns on November 2d. Less than two weeks later the American army marched into Montreal.

Colonel Warner's regiment, "too miserably clothed to endure a winter campaign in that severe climate," was honorably discharged from service by General Montgomery on November 20th, 1775, and returned to Vermont.

The furlough was short. In attempting to capture Quebec on the last day of the year 1775, General Montgomery was killed and his army badly depleted, and on January 6th, 1776, General Wooster, who succeeded Montgomery, appealed to Colonel Warner for aid. Describing this incident, in an address before the Vermont Historical and Antiquarian Society on October 16, 1848, James Davie Butler, one of the best-informed authorities on early Vermont history, said:

> After the fall of Montgomery, General Wooster who was sent for, to the command of the forces besieging Quebec, in despair of other assistance, wrote thus to Warner in Vermont:
>
> "Let me beg of you to collect immediately as many men as you can, and somehow get into this country, and stay with us till we can have relief from the colonies. Let your men be sent on by tens, twenties, thirties, forties or fifties, as they can be collected."
>
> Within eleven days from the writing of this letter at Montreal, in the dead of winter, Green Mountain Boys were on their march for Quebec. In about two months the force of effective men before that city was almost doubled by reinforcements under Warner. But for this seasonable relief, the retreat from Canada might have been

a rout, or our whole army there have been forced to capitulate.

Some of our histories mention the arrival of twenty-seven men from Massachusetts before Quebec. They are all silent respecting—what it much more behooved them to relate—ten times as many recruits from our own State. Nor do they, with one exception, so much as once mention the name of Warner in all their notices of the winter campaign in Canada.

Warner remained in Canada until the retreat of the army in May, 1776.

In the words of Daniel Chipman—to whom we are indebted for the most satisfactory account of Seth Warner—during that retreat:

> Warner took a position exposed to the greatest danger and requiring the utmost care and vigilance; he was always in the rear picking up the wounded and diseased, assisting and encouraging those who were least able to take care of themselves and generally kept but a few miles in advance of the British, who closely pursued the Americans from post to post. By calmly and steadily pursuing this course, by his habitual vigilance and care, Warner brought off most of the invalids and with this corps of the diseased and infirm, arrived at Ticonderoga a few days after the main army had taken possession of that post.

So impressed was Congress with the conduct of Warner and his comrades in that campaign, that in July, 1776, a Continental regiment was authorized out of the troops who had served with so much reputation in Canada, and Warner was commissioned by Congress, Lieutenant Colonel in command and was retained in that position by Congress notwithstanding the emphatic protest of the Provincial Congress of New York, which followed Vermont's Declaration of Independence.

No discussion of Warner would be complete without some reference to the Battle of Hubbardton, although it cannot be covered in full detail within the limits in which this address should properly be confined. Suffice it to say that as Burgoyne moved southward in his campaign of the summer of 1777, wherein he intended to push forward and effect a junction with General Howe at Albany, and

thereby split the Colonies fairly in the center, he arrived in the vicinity of Ticonderoga on July 2nd and began its investment. He found the fort in no condition to withstand a siege. Although Congress had been warned that it would be untenable, unless permanent fortifications were erected on the summit of Sugar Hill, a high eminence which entirely dominated the surrounding region, being so located that artillery placed there could be fired directly into Fort Ticonderoga and Mount Independence, and even the numbers of their defenders be counted, and that it would require at least ten thousand men and one hundred pieces of artillery for the defense of the fortifications then existing, no action was taken. The American forces, including the militia, all under the command of General Arthur St. Clair, numbered less than three thousand, and were poorly armed and ill-equipped in every way with insufficient provisions for any lengthy siege.

On July 2nd Colonel Warner wrote the Windsor Convention from Rutland, asking not only for men to be sent to Ticonderoga but that the Convention do all in its "power to supply the troops at Ticonderoga with beef as if the siege should be long they will absolutely be in want of meat kind except the country exert themselves."

Burgoyne's engineers were not long in sensing the possibilities of fortifying Sugar Hill, and on the morning of July 5th, the Americans awoke to a realization that the British were in possession of this commanding point, with a battery already installed on the height.

A council of war was held and it was determined to evacuate the fort immediately. On the early morning of July sixth the retreat began. Contrary to St. Clair's express direction, one General De Fermey set fire to his house at about two o'clock in the morning with the consequence that the resulting illumination gave Burgoyne full knowledge of the retirement. General Fraser, in command of the advance corps of Burgoyne's army, shortly started in pursuit, leaving a request that other troops be dispatched to support him.

As St. Clair left Ticonderoga and Mount Independence, Col. Ebenezer Francis was placed in command of the rear guard, but on arriving at Hubbardton, St. Clair put the rear guard, consisting of Warner and the Green Mountain Boys, Francis with his Massachusetts regiment and Col. Hale with a New Hampshire regiment, under the command of Col. Seth Warner.

The selection of Warner to command the rear guard was clearly not by chance, but by design. Circumstanced as was St. Clair at that

particular time and with the main object in view of saving his army, which was then being threatened by the close and vigorous pursuit of the flower of the English army, the command of the rear guard was one, the importance of which cannot be over-estimated. What was needed was a man of tried experience, of unwavering courage, of calm, cool and collected judgment; one who enjoyed the absolute confidence of his soldiers, who could be relied upon in every situation and whose loyalty to the cause would not admit of doubt. Such a man was Seth Warner.

Of Warner, it was said by Daniel Chipman:

> Warner had advantages in the performance of this service which no other man possessed. The Green Mountain Boys had long been armed in their own defense against the government of New York, and he had been their chosen leader. They had become habituated to turn out at his call, and follow his lead. And as they had been successful in every enterprise, they had the most unlimited confidence in his judgment, his vigilance, his prudence, and his unflinching courage. Besides they loved him for his social qualities. He sympathized with all classes, and this rendered him affable and familiar with them, and as this did not arise from any mean or selfish motive, but from the interest which he felt in the welfare of his fellow men, he ever maintained a self-respect and a dignified deportment.

St. Clair, after leaving orders with Warner to remain at Hubbardton with the rear guard for the stragglers to come in and then to follow the main army at a distance of a mile and a half in the rear, proceeded on to Castleton.

His men being extremely fatigued, Warner decided to remain at Hubbardton for the night.

Fraser had followed the pursuit with expedition from four o'clock in the morning all through the hot Sunday forenoon until about one o'clock in the afternoon, when his troops were halted to refresh themselves and await the coming of General Reidesel. Upon his arrival and after consultation in which arrangements were made for continuing the pursuit, Fraser marched forward three miles nearer Hubbardton where his detachment was halted for the night. At three

o'clock on the morning of the seventh, he resumed the pursuit and at about five, came up to Warner's position, where his advance guard under Major Grant attacked the American pickets, who were shortly driven into the main body, the Americans then being engaged in cooking their breakfast.

It was in this early morning skirmish that Major Grant, a gallant British officer, lost his life, he being probably the first casualty on either side in the Battle of Hubbardton. As his forces reached the American picket line, he mounted the stump of a tree to make observations, and had hardly given the order to his men to fire before he was struck by a rifle ball and instantly killed.

Shortly after seven o'clock the two forces arranged themselves for the coming conflict, forming within sixty yards of each other. Warner immediately opened fire, and there followed for about two hours one of the most desperately fought battles of the Revolutionary War, the result of which was at all times in the greatest uncertainty and doubt, first one side gaining the advantage, then the other. Having been pressed back by the British troops, Warner ordered a counter charge and with great gallantry not only recovered the ground lost but broke the British line, forcing them to fall back, where they again reformed and resumed the attack with a bayonet charge and again they were driven back.

Unfortunately for Warner, as the engagement opened, Col. Hale with his New Hampshire regiment, whether because of their enfeebled condition (it being said that many of them were invalids and not in physical condition to enter the combat) or for whatever reason it may have been, retired from the scene of the conflict and started in retreat for Castleton. Fraser having sent a small detachment to cover the road to Castleton, Hale and many of his men were taken prisoners without having fired a single shot. Hale was severely censured for this conduct, and he appealed to General Washington for a full inquiry, but unfortunately died while still a prisoner and before his exchange could be brought about.

Undaunted by the loss of Hale's forces, Warner, Francis and their men fought with the greatest gallantry, Francis being in command of the American right wing, which was engaged in an endeavor to turn Fraser's left. From the various accounts of the battle, it is only too apparent that Fraser, although superior in numbers and with the pick of the English army, was being worsted but, brave officer that he was, continued to hang on, hoping and praying that Reidesel and

his German forces would shortly come to his rescue. While on the other hand, Warner, well aware that following in support of Fraser would be a force sufficient to turn the scale against him, was fighting desperately to overcome Fraser before his reinforcements should arrive.

The news of the engagement having reached St. Clair, six miles away at Castleton, he immediately ordered two militia regiments, which were then within a comparatively short distance of Warner, to his support. Had they obeyed with promptness and decision, the result at Hubbardton might well have been reversed. Instead of supporting Warner, those regiments made all haste to gain the protection of the main army.

At this critical moment, when the scale was hanging in the balance, through an apparent misunderstanding of Francis' orders, some of his men fell back in retreat, and while endeavoring to realign them and return to the attack, Francis was killed. At the same time, Reidesel, with his advance troops, appeared on the scene and instantly sensing the vulnerable spot, he launched an attack on Francis' forces. Ordering his musicians to start playing to give the impression to the Americans that a large force was approaching, Reidesel advanced to the attack, his soldiers shouting and singing their battle hymns, while Francis' men, their leader gone, fell back in great confusion which at once spread to the rest of the American forces.

These occurrences combining at the critical point in the battle were too much for Warner to overcome. Seeing the battle lost and his men in retreat, even the iron nerve of Warner was momentarily shaken. "He dropped down upon a log by which he stood and poured out a torrent of execrations upon the flying troops, but he instantly arose and in a most collected manner ordered his regiment to Manchester." It is said by Mr. Chipman that this is the only instance in which Warner was "ever known to be agitated for a moment or deprived of self-possession by any disastrous occurrence however sudden and unexpected."

There has been a good deal of conflict as to the relative strength of the opposing forces at Hubbardton. Naturally the British authorities are prone to minimize their own numbers and, to say the least, not to understate the numbers of their opponents. So we find Captain Anbury (who was connected with Burgoyne's army) stating Fraser's force at the time of the engagement, exclusive of the Germans, to be eight hundred fifty; while Burgoyne himself adopts that

figure as being the extent of Fraser's strength. On the other hand, Anbury puts the American forces at two thousand, stating that at all times the British were outnumbered.

Ethan Allen (then in captivity in England) claims that Fraser's force which attacked Warner at Hubbardton was about two thousand and in this figure Allen is followed by Rowland Robinson.

Considering that in the official organization of Burgoyne's army that Fraser's advanced corps consisted of fifteen hundred and sixty-eight officers and men; that when leaving Mount Independence with a portion of his corps in pursuit of St. Clair, he ordered that the remainder of his command follow at once, with other troops to support; his expressed preference for "English troops"; that the support which he received other than his troops, was from Reidesel and his Germans, it is only fair to assume that he went into the engagement with the greater part of his entire command, and when Reidesel's contingent is taken into consideration, Fraser not only at all times greatly outnumbered Warner, but at the end he had not far from Allen's estimate of two thousand.

The number of American troops is not difficult of approximate ascertainment. St. Clair in one instance states it to be "about a thousand"; in another report, he says "twelve hundred including stragglers and infirm."

Five days before the battle, Warner himself reported "about seven or eight hundred"; while Brockholst Livingston, an officer at Ticonderoga, wrote his uncle, Governor Livingston of New Jersey, on July 3rd that "Warner is expected today with six hundred Green Mountain Boys." Senator Crockett states the whole number of Warner's, Francis' and Hale's regiments to be about thirteen hundred in all, and when Hale's regiment is eliminated (as it was), it is plainly evident that Mr. Crockett is as nearly correct as it is possible to be, when he says that Warner's forces were reduced to seven or eight hundred when Hale left with his men. So we find that Warner and Francis, outnumbered by nearly, if not more than, two to one during all stages of the battle, and confronted with the very cream of Burgoyne's army, not only held the enemy to even terms, but were gradually gaining the victory, when the situation was so suddenly changed by the untimely death of Francis and the arrival of Reidesel with his German troops. One may conceive of Hubbardton as a miniature Waterloo, where the fate of English arms was preserved by the similar timely arrival of Blucher.

Having considered somewhat the relative size of the contending forces, let us for a moment take up the number of casualties sustained by each. There is quite substantial agreement among the authorities as to the number of British dead and wounded.

The Earl of Balcarras, who was with Fraser's corps, testified before Parliament that without including the German casualties, he thinks Fraser lost about one hundred fifty killed and wounded. The American authorities (except for Ethan Allen, who says there were three hundred killed), put the British killed and wounded at one hundred eighty-three.

Practically all American authorities place the number of Americans killed, wounded and prisoners at three hundred twenty-four; Thompson stating, on the authority of Ethan Allen, that thirty of these were killed.

Adopting three hundred twenty-four as the correct figure, it remains to be seen how many of these were killed and wounded so that we may have a basis for comparison with the British losses. It should be remembered that the bulk of the prisoners taken (if not all) were Hale's men who were captured without inflicting any damage on the enemy. Fortunately we have a detailed record of the number of prisoners taken by the British. Burgoyne himself is relied on in this respect, for although his account of the number killed and wounded is too extravagant for serious consideration, the number of prisoners in his hands was the subject of an accurate count, and padded estimates were not only unnecessary, but the discrepancy would be too easily detected.

He reports to the British ministry on July 11, 1777, that "one colonel, seven captains, ten subalterns and 210 men were made prisoners." Deducting the total of two hundred twenty-eight from the total casualties of three hundred twenty-four, we find that ninety-six were killed or wounded.

Although St. Clair reported to Washington that the American killed and wounded amounted to only fifty, the overwhelming weight of authority shows the losses of that character to have exceeded ninety.

Using this figure it will be noted at once that while outnumbered two to one (and more at the end) Warner inflicted on the British twice the number of casualties in killed and wounded that he sustained himself.

True, Hubbardton must be classed as a defeat for American arms,

if the mere triumph of superior over greatly inferior numbers, resulting in the compulsory withdrawal of the smaller force, is to be the criterion. But on this basis, so was Bunker Hill a defeat. Yet would anyone have the temerity to suggest that the fact that the British were left in possession of the field at Bunker Hill, in any way reflected on the immortal glory of American valor attained on that day? Must an overwhelming victory be essential to honorable fame? History affords too many instances to the contrary to make that condition the sole test.

Considered in the light of the object for which it was fought, namely, the security of St. Clair's retreat, Hubbardton was a substantial success. The enemy received such a check on that day as to wholly disable them from immediate effective pursuit of St. Clair.

Convincingly the fact stands out, that by Warner's courageous and energetic stand at Hubbardton, the safety of St. Clair's army was assured.

Considered in the light of the courageous conduct of our troops in the face of substantial odds; the damage inflicted on the enemy; the severity of the conflict while it lasted; that it was the only battle fought on Vermont's soil during the Revolution; and the fact that Warner brought off his regiment to fight another day, when their presence and actions on the battlefield turned a doubtful result into a sweeping victory;—assuredly Hubbardton deserves far greater notice than it has yet received from historians—Senator Crockett being the only one to recognize adequately the importance of the engagement.

Considered in the light of the fact that Warner, with less than one-half of the force commanded by Stark at Bennington, was opposed by the flower of the English Army, which with their support, constituted an enemy at all times greater in number than the combined forces of Baum and Breyman, whom Stark engaged separately; that the British loss in killed and wounded was but a trifle less at Hubbardton than at Bennington, while the American casualties in killed and wounded at Hubbardton exceeded by fifteen to thirty like casualties at Bennington, although the actual period of time occupied by the fight was but an hour and twenty-five minutes, is it not apparent that Hubbardton more nearly approaches the character of a major engagement than has generally been considered?

Considered as the first in a chain of events leading from the capture of Ticonderoga by Burgoyne, to the glorious American victories

at Bennington, at Fort Stanwix, at Stillwater, and to the final breaking up and capture of Burgoyne's entire army at Saratoga, but three and a half months later, the gallant fight at Hubbardton shines forth as the first bright star in the darkness and gloom which followed the loss of Ticonderoga; it aroused the inhabitants of Vermont and the surrounding territory to turn out in ever increasing numbers to the defense of their homes, their firesides and their liberties, until Burgoyne was impelled to burst forth in lament:

> The Hampshire Grants in particular, a country unpeopled and almost unknown in the last war, now abounds in the most active and most rebellious race of the continent, and hangs like a gathering storm upon my left.

Warner's men gathered at Manchester where he was joined by others, and there, acting under the orders of General Schuyler, he remained for a time protecting the country against further invasion by the enemy. There he was joined by General Stark with his New Hampshire troops which had been sent at the request of the Vermont Council of Safety. Later Warner removed with Stark to Bennington on August 9th, leaving the remnant of his regiment at Manchester under the command of Lt. Col. Safford.

Upon notice of the approach of Baum's troops, with Stark he planned the coming battle and during the first engagement was with Stark, coöperating in every way to the successful outcome. His troops, having been ordered from Manchester, arrived too late to participate in the first battle. As all know, after the successful fight with Baum, the American Army scattered and was not in the best condition to repel the assault of the second contingent of the British Army under Breyman. Stark, and some of his advisors, felt that a stand should not be made but that a retreat should be ordered to enable him to form his scattered forces in regular order of battle. Warner's counsel prevailed, however, and spirited resistance was offered, although the tide of battle was going against Stark, when Warner's men arrived on the scene and furnished a rallying point for the Americans. They attacked Breyman with such vigor that he was soon compelled to retreat. Darkness put an end to further pursuit, and Bennington became a victory which imbued new life in the cause of America, with corresponding depression for Burgoyne.

There must have been more than ordinary satisfaction to Warner and his regiment at the outcome, which was characterized by Stark

in a postscript to his report to the New Hampshire Council, as follows:

> *I think in this action we have returned the enemy a proper compliment for their Hubbardton engagement,*

for it was Breyman's contingent in Reidesel's corps whose arrival turned the tide against Warner at Hubbardton. It was Breyman's contingent that was sent flying back to Burgoyne by the timely arrival of Warner's regiment at Bennington.

Stark was generous in his praise of Warner in his report to General Gates. Among other things he said (referring to the engagement with Baum):

> *I then marched in company with Colonels Warner, Williams, Herrick and Brush, with all the men who were present.*

After reporting on the events of the day he continued:

> *I cannot particularize any officer, as they all behaved with the greatest spirit and bravery. Colonel Warner's superior skill in the action was of extraordinary service to me; I would be glad if he and his men could be recommended to Congress.*

On March 20, 1778, the General Assembly at its first Session held at Windsor,

> *VOTED*
>
> *Seth Warner, Esquire, be and is hereby appointed Brigadier General.*

Although he was the first Brigadier General ever appointed in Vermont, his name does not appear as such in the "List of Officers in Command" compiled by Mr. John E. Goodrich for Vermont Revolutionary Rolls; nor have I ever seen him so referred to.

Ethan Allen was appointed a Brigadier General on June 3, 1779, and thereafter went by that title.

Many Returns of Warner's Regiment can be found in the "Revolutionary Rolls," which were signed by Warner, and which show that he was in command of his regiment, but personally in Arlington on February 9, 1780, and in Bennington on December 21, 1780.

On April 12, 1783, at Bennington, he signed an order on the State Treasurer to pay Lieut. Simeon Harrison twenty pounds, and charge the same to his account.

Some of the conditions with which we are to-day so seriously confronted were common to Warner and his contemporaries. I refer particularly to depreciation of the currency. Let us hope and pray that we shall not continue to experiment with monetary values to such an extent that history may repeat itself, and our currency once again be "not worth a continental."

On October 23, 1779, resolutions were adopted by the General Assembly as follows:

> *Resolved, that this Assembly pledge the faith of this State to make good the depreciation of the circulating medium to all the officers and soldiers of Colonel Seth Warner's regiment that were inhabitants of this State when they engaged in said regiment.*

Yet money was scarce, and on August 28, 1781, after more or less consideration of the matter by the Assembly for about a year, there was granted to Colonel Seth Warner and his officers and men —in part payment of the depreciation of the currency below the value agreed to be paid at the time of enlistment—the township of Eden.

On January 31, 1783, the final adjustment of accounts with Colonel Warner's regiment, including the depreciation element, and crediting with payments in money or land, disclosed a total balance due of 2694 pounds, 15 shillings and 1½ pence, of which there was due Seth Warner 236 pounds, 2 shillings, 3¼ pence. The record indicates that it was paid.

Warner continued in command of his regiment until nearly the end of the year 1781, although after the end of the year 1777 his health was such that he was not able to be with them in the field at all times. Notwithstanding his physical ailments, he continued in active service until September 1780, when he was wounded near Fort George, and obliged to retire from the field for the last time.

Speaking of his service at Lake George Landing, Mr. James Davie Butler says:

> In describing the operations at Lake George Landing, by which the vessels, in which Burgoyne might have retreated, were captured, both Williams and Thompson

leave Warner's name unmentioned. But Warner was the Commander of that expedition. Those whose names are mentioned—Brown, Woodbridge and Johnson—were his subalterns.

Why is Warner not more adequately recognized in our historical writings? Warner was not given to self-advertising. He was not a prolific writer of tracts, pamphlets or proclamations. He was primarily a soldier. He was not one ever to put himself forward, except in the strict line of his duty. Then he was surpassed by none. But when occasion required he could write as pithy and forceful phrases as any, as the following, contained in his letter of July 2, 1777, to the Convention, when asking aid for Ticonderoga, will bear witness:

> *Their lines are so much in want of men, I should be glad that a few hills of corn unhoed should not be a motive sufficient to detain men at home, considering the loss of such an important post can hardly be recovered.*

Warner's naturally strong and vigorous constitution "gave way under the fatigues and hardships which he endured in the service, particularly in his winter campaign in Canada," and his health steadily declined until 1784 when in the hope of obtaining some relief from his sufferings, he returned to his native parish of Roxbury, Connecticut. His hopes were vain, for his condition grew steadily worse until his mind became affected, and at times it was necessary to use physical restraint when, in his delirium, he lived over again the battles he had fought for his country. On December 26, 1784, at the early age of forty-one, death intervened to end his sufferings, and Seth Warner passed on to his final reward.

Thus passed Seth Warner, citizen, patriot, soldier, Vermont's great hero, to whose memory is owed a debt of eternal gratitude which we now reverently acknowledge, but can never adequately repay.

> *He left behind him a long record of deeds well done, a spotless reputation, an empty pocket and an independent Vermont.*

Touching as is the romantic story which Thompson weaves around Colonel "Warrington" and "Alma Hendee" in "The Green Moun-

tain Boys," it must not be taken as based on fact, and those romantically inclined should bear in mind that Warner was married ten or eleven years before the scenes at Hubbardton, to Hester (or Esther) Hurd, of Roxbury, Connecticut, who, with three children, survived him.

For the same reason, all should understand that the imaginary tale "The Haunted Fortress," by Jonathan Parker, published in Rutland in 1830, in the book entitled "American Legendary," and which concerns the love affairs of Colonel Seth Warner and Sarah Graham, and the capture of Crown Point, is to be taken as an example of the romantic literature of the times, and wholly without foundation either in fact or in legend.

But Warner's life was not all he gave to Vermont and America. He had been so long occupied in the defense of the New Hampshire Grants prior to the war, and of his Country during the war, that his private concerns had been wholly neglected. What lands he had acquired had been sold for taxes, and his last days were saddened and beclouded by the knowledge that all was gone. He died insolvent, leaving his family destitute.

Subsequently his widow applied to Congress for some remuneration for her husband's services, but the amount of relief afforded her was small.

In 1787, the legislature of Vermont granted his widow two thousand acres of land in Essex County. At that time, it was expected that this land would become valuable, as settlements increased, and it was thought to be a generous gift, but it proved to be of little value, and doubtless afforded Mrs. Warner small assistance for the relief of her immediate needs.

Seth Warner was buried in the "Old Burying Ground" at Roxbury, with the honors of war. A simple stone, with an appropriate legend recounting his merit, containing among other things the statement that he fought sixteen battles for his country, was erected over his grave,—and then *he was forgotten* until 75 years later, when Mr. Cothern, in his *History of Ancient Woodbury*, severely castigated the people of Connecticut for such unseemingly neglect, and as a result, in 1859, the State of Connecticut moved his remains to a more public place and erected a suitable monument with appropriate inscriptions to commemorate his final resting-place.

In the same year, patriotic citizens of Hubbardton, Castleton and vicinity, by private subscription, erected a monument near the site of

the Battle of Hubbardton, known as the "Hubbardton Battle Monument," which was transferred to the Vermont Historical Society on July 6, 1927. It stands near a little travelled highway in a thinly populated section of the town, where but few have occasion to see the names of Warner and Francis which are carved thereon.

Vermont has been unsparing in her tributes to that other great leader of the Green Mountain Boys—Ethan Allen,—and justly so. His name and face are perpetuated in marble, granite and bronze. The only government military post in Vermont bears his name. His statue stands in the National Capitol, and his name is familiar wherever the history of our commonwealth is known. Without lessening in the slightest degree our pride in and admiration for this outstanding character in our early history, may we not recognize to a greater degree than we have in the past, the distinguished and invaluable services of his great colleague, Seth Warner.

May Vermont never forget her debt to him. May she never overlook an opportunity to do him honor. May this marker be the beginning of a movement that will make the name of Seth Warner familiar in every household in our state. May the record of his deeds shine forth with undiminished luster for all time to come.

Seth Warner gave his all to Vermont. Can we do less than keep the recollection of his noble life and his invaluable services "deep graven on these grateful hearts 'til memory be dead"?

ETHAN ALLEN. *A REVIEW*

By John Clement

Whether a definitive biography of Allen will ever appear is doubtful. The center of controversy in his own time, the years have not softened nor clarified the outline of a vigorous man of many parts—a fighter, a leader of men, a scholar of no mean ability, an author with power in his pen, a speaker to whom others listened, an iconoclast of the first water, a tavern "cup-up," the comrade of outlaws, the friend of statesmen. Like Coolidge he is something of an enigma; like Coolidge he has never found a native-born Vermonter who was competent or interested enough to attempt a thoroughgoing biography in his behalf. Debunkers in Vermont and elsewhere have carved at his reputation and deeds, but Allen emerges from the hewing process still dominant, still appealing to the imaginations of men, and particularly to Vermont boys—a hero still. Mr. Holbrook's book is the latest attempt to capture the elusive Allen. Mr. Clement's review is designed to evaluate the book in terms that assign it to its proper place in the estimates of Allen. Our general editorial policy is to assign a volume to a reviewer who is known to us to possess an ample and authoritative command of the particular background against which a book is written. Mr. Clement qualifies fully on this count. Editor.

Ethan Allen. By Stewart H. Holbrook. Pp. viii, 283. The Macmillan Company. New York. 1940. $2.50.

When Daniel P. Thompson wrote the *Green Mountain Boys* about a century ago, he wrote an historical novel in the fashion of the time. Scott and Cooper had already written many such, and the romance with incidental history was very popular. The history was put in for flavor, and warped at will to fit the needs of the romance. People read the novels and did not read the relatively few and usually uncritical histories.

Unfortunately, from the historical viewpoint, the readers of the novels of Thompson and others learned their history from the novels,

and thus learned it to a large extent wrong. Unfortunately, also, Thompson knew and talked with some of the old survivors of the Revolution and did not record the talks but merely translated them into general impressions. His failure in that respect was a distinct loss to history, although possibly a gain to literature. Thompson simply did not take an interest in facts, and did not pretend it.

This year, Mr. Holbrook has produced a book about Ethan Allen which has some of the trappings of a sound historical biography, but is far from sound as to facts. When he went to Montpelier to make some investigation, he very naturally called on Mrs. Mary G. Nye, the careful copyist, editor, and indexer of the manuscript Vermont State Papers. She suggested examination of documentary material for facts. She tells me that Mr. Holbrook said he was not interested in facts, but merely wanted color. That explains a lot that the author's introduction does not explain, or rather denies.

The author's introduction notes that few have ever heard more about Ethan Allen than the fact that he captured Ticonderoga, and shouted a "deathless incredible line." He thinks there was more about Ethan deserving of notice and common knowledge; and to cure this defect in such a "deplorable condition" he wrote this book. He also wants to cure the notion that Ethan Allen was a "stuffed-shirt hero of schoolbooks, a sort of glittering demi-god, immaculate and bloodless—as though some Parson Weems had laid withering hands on his hardy unregenerate soul."

The real keynote to the volume is contained in the assertion that "right to the end of his life he was a swashbuckling, hell-roaring, indomitable man—the one and original old ring-tailed peeler." The author sets out to demonstrate this thesis, facts or no facts. He goes at it hammer and tongs. He uses a sort of sports-writer lingo, with some facility.

The unfortunate thing is that a lot of people have read this book, absorbed his catch-words into their picture of Ethan Allen, and think they have obtained some added information about history that is true and colorful.

For example, at a recent gathering of Vermonters, the host served a drink according to Mr. Holbrook's definition of a "stonewall." Namely, rum and hard cider. Your editor mentioned Ethan Allen's favorite drink, and two or three voices responded, "a stonewall," showing that they had read Holbrook. Where Mr. Holbrook got his information I do not know. It may be correct. In one original

bill for drinks bought by Ethan Allen, there is no mention of it. I have casually examined some tavern account books of the period, and have never seen this term in a Vermont account book. It may be there, just the same.

I have never heard the term used in Vermont as a current term for a drink. I have heard it used, in Connecticut, twenty-five years ago, as indicating an old New Jersey concoction of apple-jack and hard cider. The Vermont tavern accounts mention such things as flip, grog, punch, and rum in the 1770-1800 period, but I have never seen mention of a "stonewall." I suspect Mr. Holbrook thought it was a colorful word, and used it regardless. Incidentally, the *stonewall* of which the author makes so much was in part composed of hard cider. It seems unlikely that Vermont towns, at such an early date, would have had appletrees bearing fruit in sufficient quantity to produce much cider. Evidently they raised appletrees from seed, in those days. But I may be wrong and Mr. Holbrook may be right.

When Mr. Holbrook says: "*General George Washington thought him an original, like nothing else that walked,*" he is merely translating into modern exaggerated form what Washington actually wrote: "*There is an original something in him that commands attention.*" If the reader understands that Mr. Holbrook warps things in such a way, all through his book, the reader will take the book with much salt.

Time after time, Mr. Holbrook invents conversations, usually with an oath, and inserts them in quotes as if they were capable of proof. These are placed on an equal footing with documentary evidence, the statements of contemporaries, and the more or less contemporary statements of actual participants. One can *trust nothing* in this book unless it can be *proved.*

Of course it is hard to disprove an assertion for which there is *no known proof.* Now and then Mr. Holbrook may have found sound proof for his apparently fantastic statements, from sources completely unknown to this reviewer.

His disregard of facts can be gathered from a few random samples, such as this. On page 8, the author paints the first meeting of Allen and Arnold on the shore of Hand's Cove, at two o'clock in the morning of May 10th, 1775. He makes a pretty picture. But the evidence is that Allen left Castleton on May 8th, for Wessel's in Shoreham; and that Arnold followed him the same day. Both should have reached Shoreham on the 8th. It is *inconceivable* that

Arnold could have spent the afternoon and moonlit evening of May 8th, and all May 9th, and until 2:00 A.M. of May 10th, in riding from Castleton to Shoreham, a distance of not more than 30 miles. Arnold was mounted, Allen probably was.

Another test of his accuracy is found on page 9. Here, speaking of the expedition getting ready to cross the lake and take Ticonderoga, he says: "What worried Ethan more than the subject of command was how he was going to get his troops across the lake. The moon, in its *fourth* quarter, had set."

No such statement is contained in any contemporary account I know. I have never noticed a moon in its fourth quarter setting at that time. Consequently I made inquiry, and learned from the Director of the Nautical Almanac of the United States Naval Observatory the following facts: the moon rose, on May 9th, 1775, in the vicinity of Ticonderoga, at about 1:00 P.M. It set at about 2:30 A.M., on May 10th. It was then two days past *first quarter*. The time of sunrise, May 10th, was about 4:40 A.M. Mr. Holbrook was almost right as to the time of moonset, but all wrong as to the quarter. One must guess that he borrowed the information from an unreliable source, or invented it.

These two errors, slight as they are, but easy as they are to check, indicate that Mr. Holbrook had no interest in historical accuracy, so far as that is possible. He could have checked both, had he so wished. Rather, he embroidered his theme on his own patterns.

It is not my intention to state that everything Holbrook says is absolutely wrong. I admit he is right in most of his definite statements, and wrong less often. Nobody could write a vivid biography of Ethan Allen without following *some* of the old statements and the documentary evidence. Nobody could do it *well* without exploring all the evidence, and forming some kind of rational opinion based on established principles, where the evidence is not clear, or conflicting. It appears that Holbrook did not care to examine the whole evidence, and that his reactions to such evidence as he did examine are sometimes unsound, illogical, and even absurd.

Take the "classic moment" of Ticonderoga. There are several accounts by persons who were present, each telling different things, in some details, but all agreeing that Ticonderoga was captured and that Ethan Allen was there. Among the most important accounts are the recently discovered report of the British lieutenant, Feltham, and the narrative of Ethan Allen. Both were in a position to know a

part of what happened, from personal observation. Each, in some respects, had a conceivable motive for stating certain things to his own advantage. In *other* respects, neither had the slightest purpose in misrepresentation; and the statements of both, so made, can be taken as true if they can be reconciled. In many respects that can be done readily, and with no stretching of imagination.

However, in just such respects, Holbrook has no hesitation in contradicting Allen and Feltham as to what they say they saw, and putting in place of their statements a freakish reconstruction for which there is no support other than the Holbrookian imagination. Holbrook implies that Allen could not tell Feltham and Delaplace apart, even though he must have seen them often in the days after the capture. He implies that when Feltham says he was observed as he made his second trip to the quarters of Delaplace, having put on his coat and waistcoat, Feltham must have been without his breeches. I figure Allen got to know them apart, even if he did not at the start; and that everyone else in his party learned the difference. I figure that Feltham knew his coat from his pants, and must, like most men, have put on his pants before his coat. But maybe I am wrong. Maybe Holbrook knows more about this than Allen or Feltham. But if so, considering his disregard for the value of evidence, *how does he know?*

One could go on and on, and devote several volumes to a documented and explanatory discussion of the errors of Mr. Holbrook. There's no room for it here. There is room, however, to point out that in the *first* account of the capture of Ticonderoga he indicates that the whole expedition was cooked up on the spur of the moment; and in the *second* account he reveals that the Green Mountain Boys had been a trained organization for four years, well-armed and well-led, and had made careful plans for the expedition during a period of three or four months. These accounts do not fit together.

It is interesting to note that Mr. Holbrook lifted bodily, but without quotes, the list of arms and equipment of the captors of Ticonderoga which Mr. Pell inserts as an imaginative description, in his biography. With Mr. Pell it was just a guess that the Green Mountain Boys, who had fowling pieces for food supply, also had miscellaneous military equipment left over from the French Wars. With Mr. Holbrook, it becomes a certainty, unnecessary to acknowledge.

The book does stir up interest in a notable Vermont leader. It is dramatic. A lot of it is true. And a considerable part is false, partly

because Mr. Holbrook did not care for truth, and partly because he wanted to put over his own conception, regardless of evidence.

The book fails to tackle a number of highly controversial matters, and makes no contribution in such respects. It conveys misleading impressions, time after time. It has had very good reviews, and very good sales. I enjoyed reading it, and you may, too. All the same, it is poor history, poor biography, poor analysis, and mediocre writing. It gets by as flash-sport headlines.

VERMONT'S PART IN INDUSTRY

By Ralph W. Putnam

History is not, as we have gently insinuated in our editorial notes, a mere matter of men and events, battles and battle grounds; it is far more, or should be—the recreation of industries, the retelling of the human mind and spirit trying to fashion a livable and more comfortable and secure world. From the very beginning, Vermonters were not only interested in making a homeland with axe and musket, but also in working out a way of living with what was at hand. Chasing the Yorkers out of the Grants was spectacular; battling their environment with practical weapons was certainly as important in many ways. The paper which we are offering on Vermont's part in industry was prepared for a club of professional and business men. We asked Mr. Putnam to give us the pleasure of making it more widely useful, and he assented with the warning that it represents nothing original in research, simply is an assembling of information that he found interesting. He quotes the late Will Rogers—"All I know is what I read in the papers." His point of view, he adds, is reflected in this statement by Calvin Coolidge: "We review the past, not in order to return to it, but that we may find in what direction it points to the future." Editor.

THE early pioneers who settled Vermont were, in many respects, a choice people. They were of Scotch, Irish, and English descent, bold, adventuresome, and enterprising. They were young in years, their average age being twenty-six years. They left the older settled portions of New England to establish new homes in the wilderness in what was then the New Hampshire Grants. They came into the wilderness with a rifle, an axe, a few farming tools, and a bag of seeds, strapped upon the back of the family horse, or upon their own shoulders, knowing that their very life, and their ability to survive, depended upon their own industry and courage. It is hard for us, you and me (their children), to visualize the courage—the energy of mind—that prompted these sturdy settlers to leave home and friends, and to attempt to weld, out of the forest solitude, a home for wife and children.

The English Colonies in America were exploited upon the old English Mercantile system, that of England being supported by her possessions. All raw materials and farm products were produced for consumption by the Mother Country. No English colony was encouraged to manufacture or to fabricate. The Colonies *must* purchase manufactured goods from England, and thereby enrich England. This repressive policy held in check the industrial development of the American Colonies and added fuel to the flame of dissension that led to the American Revolution. The settler was, of necessity, a farmer. With the axe, the auger, the shave and the jack-knife, the farmer-settler formed the tools for his labor. If he broke his axe-helve, chopping in the forest, he made a new one from the stick of tough ash seasoning in his lean-to shed. If one of the oxen broke a bow, a new one was shaped and ready for its place. The yoke itself was of his forming. Clad in homespun, he sat down to eat his humble meal in a home, built with his own hands, on a chair that he fashioned, at a table of his making, and ate from home-made dishes food that had ripened in the sun, that daily passed across the blue, over his little clearing. In his every step he was a marvel of resource and self-reliance. The forest gave him material for shelter and for tools; the soil gave him food.

His first labor when he arrived at his "pitch" was to find a stream or a spring. Here he cleared a small space and in the opening in the forest built a shelter to protect him from the storms. In your tramps over Vermont's hillsides, when you find an old cellar hole, near it you will find a brook, a stream, or a caved-in well. After the shelter, or log-cabin was built, our pioneer settler attacked the forest. He cut down the trees, rolled them into piles and burned them. Many a settler who followed the pioneer into the new country, was guided on his way by the smoke and odor from the axe-man's fire. The hardwood trees were separated from the spruce, fir, and pine, and the hardwood ashes leached to form lye. This lye formed potassium carbonate, or potash. Potash was used in the making of soap and glass. When refined it became pearl ash, carbonate of potash, or saleratus, used for the same purpose as we now use soda. Potash was the first Vermont produce to have a money value. It is of interest to note, that the first patent issued by the U. S. Government,—patent No. 1,—was granted July 31st, 1790, to Samuel Hopkins of Burlington, for a process of making potash.

The first mechanical appliance of the early settler was the plump-

ing mill. This device was used to crush corn. A saucer-shaped hole was fashioned in the top of a hardwood stump. To a live sapling was fastened, by a raw-hide lace, a piece of wood or a stone shaped to fill the saucer-shaped cavity. Corn was placed in the cavity, and by plumping the weight up and down, the corn was crushed. This was a slow and laborious operation, and necessity led to the community grist mill. These mills were located on a water-power site and were the first industry.

The town of Arlington gave fifty acres to Remember Baker, who built on East Brook the first saw and grist mill.

Next came the sawmills. The natural resources of Vermont laid the foundation for its manufacturing. Many towns offered a bounty to the person who would erect a mill.

Matthew Lyon, in 1796, owned a printing office, and made his paper from basswood bark.

Iron was in great demand, and so the settlers searched out the bog iron in the vicinity of their homes, and erected smelters and forges.

Matthew Lyon built a dam on the river at Fair Haven and made iron as early as 1785.

Ira Allen constructed a dam at Winooski Falls, and built a grist-mill, two sawmills, a furnace, and two forges.

There was a furnace in Tinmouth in 1783. Also at Middletown and Vergennes. One in Bennington. Two in Wallingford. One was built in Sheldon in 1799. One in Swanton in 1800. In Sheldon more than 100 men were employed, and the iron produced was called "Sheldon Currency."

A stone quarry was opened in Isle La Motte before 1796.

Isaac Underhill opened the Dorset marble quarry in 1785. Marble headstones were first made there in 1808.

The Middlebury quarry was opened in 1803, and the first marble-saw was used there.

The first marble mill in Swanton was built in 1812.

Slate and brick were among the early industries. Glass was made in Brandon in 1811.

The early settlers made their own shoes and clothing. Hides from the animals, wool from the flocks, flax from the soil. Spun on the wheel, dyed from the barks and roots. Not until 1781 was there a woolen mill.

Cotton cloth was first made in 1820 by Isaac Fisher, Jr., of Springfield.

Two Windsor County towns stand out in mechanical history, as the birthplace of Vermont industry—Windsor and Springfield—and Vermonters should reverence the inventors, their early forebears, who gave so liberally of their inventive genius.

Joseph Wickham Roe, one of the leading industrial historians and mechanical engineers, has said, "but few plants have had so great an influence upon American manufacturing, as has the mechanical developments issuing from Windsor."

There was no particular reason why Windsor should have played so prominent a part in the industrial world. It lacked transportation; it was at a distance from large populated centers; it was small in the number of its people.

Mill Creek, a stream flowing into the Connecticut, has a fall of sixty feet within a third of a mile, and here in August 1764 came Steele Smith. Following Smith came Israel Curtis, who built a sawmill on the upper fall, and a grist mill on the lower fall. At these two falls was started the mechanical history of Windsor.

The War of 1812 demonstrated to the American people that to survive they must be self-dependent.

A little carding-mill was built on the falls and later was converted into a weaving plant that manufactured cloth from the wool of the native sheep. In 1818, this plant went out of business, being unable to compete with imported goods brought in after the close of the war.

The year 1815 marks the beginning of the era of Windsor inventors. The first of these inventors was Lemuel Hedge, who on June 21, 1815, patented a process for ruling blank-books, and on March 3, 1817, a revolving machine for the same purpose. Thomas Pomroy was the town printer. Pomroy and Hedge formed a partnership and manufactured the ruling machine, until their shop burned. This Hedge patent is the basis for all modern ruling machines now in use.

In 1827, we find Hedge as the inventor and patentee of an "Engine for Dividing Scales." This invention was of national importance in the development of the machine industry, as it made possible, by quantity production, the interchangeability of manufacture. Hedge started manufacturing these machines in Windsor, but lacking capital, moved to Brattleboro. After some years his concern was absorbed by the Stanley Rule & Level Co., of New Britain, Conn. Hedge also invented the two-foot folding rule, and in 1849, the

band-saw, used over the world in *exactly the same form as when perfected by Lemuel Hedge.*

In July, 1827, John M. Cooper of Guildhall came to Windsor to build the Cooper rotative piston pump. Cooper was on the right track, but did not go far enough, and his pump failed to work.

Next came Ashahel Hubbard, a resident of West Windsor, who in 1828 patented the "Revolving Hydraulic Pump." Jabez Proctor, father of the late Senator Redfield Proctor, furnished the funds, and the National Hydraulic Co. was organized. The pump manufactured by the company, unchanged in principle, is still being used for pumping water, oil, and for use in fire-engines.

Did you know that the gunsmiths of America came from Vermont, and that the modern rifle was "born" in Windsor? Nicanor Kendall, a native of West Windsor, invented the Kendall rifle. Kendall married the daughter of Ashahel Hubbard, and with his father-in-law, Hubbard, started the manufacture of the rifle. Two of the original rifles are in the museum in the Tower of London. One is in the collection of the Vermont Historical Society. Hubbard sold out to Kendall in 1839, and in 1843 Kendall arranged a partnership with Richard Smith Lawrence of Chester, Vermont. Funds were needed, so Samuel E. Robbins was taken into the firm, which then became Robbins, Kendall, and Lawrence.

Ten thousand rifles were made and sold to the U. S. Government for use in the Mexican War, at a selling price of $10.90 each. In 1847, men in the plant of Robbins & Lawrence Co., Windsor, Vermont, worked diligently to complete a government order for 10,000 rifles. The terms of the contract called for completion of the work in three years, but the Robbins & Lawrence workers finished eighteen months ahead of schedule. The guns were delivered. Mr. Lawrence traveled to Washington and was told by Gen. Talcott of the Ordnance Board that it was the only gun contract ever finished within the contract time. "A fine stand of arms, Sir . . . 62% passed inspection," said the General; and on the face of such superb manufacturing, a new contract for 15,000 more rifles was awarded immediately. This was modern efficiency ninety years ago, when a thirty-eight per cent scrap loss was not frowned upon. But what of to-day?

Mr. Kendall withdrew from the company in 1849, leaving Lawrence as the managing head.

Lawrence brought some remarkable "inventors" into his organiza-

tion: men whose names came to mean—firearms. These men were Henry D. Stone and Frederick W. Howe, who with Richard Lawrence are ranked among the great American mechanical geniuses. Other men whom Mr. Lawrence interested in his plant were Benjamin Henry, Daniel Wesson, Christian Sharpe. Mr. Henry was the grandson of Benjamin Tyler, who supplied the bog iron from his West Claremont iron works for the early Windsor mechanics.

Lawrence and Henry corrected the faults of the Jennings repeating rifle, and it became the "Henry Rifle" of the Civil War days. When Governor Winchester founded his company, this Henry rifle became the Winchester repeating rifle.

Daniel Wesson founded the Smith & Wesson Co. Christian Sharpe invented the breech-loading rifle and brought it to Windsor in 1848.

The *sharp shooter* of the Civil War was not so called from his *eyesight*, but from his *Sharpe* rifle that he carried.

Robbins & Lawrence Co. originated the "Interchangeable U. S. Army Rifle," the parts of which could be mixed and reassembled upon the field. Six of these rifles were exhibited at the Crystal Palace in London, in 1851, and 25,000 were manufactured at Windsor for the English Government and used in the Crimean War. This rifle became the English Enfield. All the finest rifles used throughout the world can be traced to Windsor inventors.

The English Government's order for 25,000 rifles for use in the Crimean War proved unfortunate for the financial success of Robbins & Lawrence and in 1856 the concern went into receivership. A new company was formed and guns were made for use in the Civil War.

Henry D. Stone had invented the turret lathe and as the years passed by the new company turned its endeavor to perfecting and manufacturing machine tools.

In 1864 Ebenezer G. Lamson secured control of the business. Mr. Lamson interested Russell L. Jones to invest, and the new concern became Jones & Lamson. In May, 1876, it was incorporated as the Jones & Lamson Machine Co. In 1880, Adner Brown and Amesa Woolson purchased the business and moved it to Springfield. James Hartness became superintendent, and in 1900 its president.

The product of the Jones & Lamson Machine Co., automatic turret lathes, is known throughout the industrial world.

Not alone in firearms did these workmen in the Robbins & Lawrence plant excel. Charles E. Billings and Christopher Spencer

founded the Billings & Spencer Co., the largest drop forging company in the world. George A. Fairfield founded the Weed Sewing Machine Co., and with Mr. Spencer, the Hartford Machine Screw Co., the concern that introduced the automatic screw machine. Frederick Howe founded the Brown & Sharp Manufacturing Co. Henry D. Stone with Mr. Howe built at Windsor the modern turret lathe, Howe at Windsor the Lincoln milling machine; Henry D. Stone and Edwin Clark, the White sewing machine. Hiram Berdan invented the Berdan rifle; Albert Bell, the Bell repeating rifle, and he also founded the Sullivan Machine Co. William Palmer invented the Palmer carbine, Quimby Backus, the Backus vise. Frederick D. Wells founded the Greenfield Tap and Die Co. George Coates invented the Coates clipper machine and the flexible shaft. Henry D. Stone, Ebenezer G. Lamson, and Russell L. Jones founded the Jones & Lamson Machine Co.

No words of mine can express a deserving tribute to these Windsor workmen, who in the small inland town of Windsor conceived and built those mechanical devices that in no small measure promoted the mechanical development of to-day.

To Springfield, Vermont, we should give large credit for inventive genius and accomplishments. Over 200 patents have been granted to Springfield inventors. John Davidson and Frederick Parks invented machines for finishing woolen cloth, made a rotary churn, a vibrating machine for shearing sheep, and founded the Parks & Woolson Machine Co., which now manufactures textile machinery.

David Smith invented the only lock that cannot be picked, the first lathe dog, the split clothespin, the blanket hook and eye, used in the Army and Navy, the corn-planter, an adding machine, a breech-loading rifle, and many other improvements in machinery. The Rev. Pinckney Frost patented the scythe snath; the brothers, Joseph and Isaac Frost, the harness hame; Jesse Warren, the Warren land plow; Joel Ellis, in 1848, a steam shovel that was used in building the early Vermont railroads. Luke Taylor patented a mop, and B. B. Coates a wringer for Taylor's mop. A. J. Fullam invented the hair clipper (the grandfather of the one the barber uses on your neck); Noah Safford the hay cutter; Alvin Mason, a machine for making hooks and eyes; Joel Ellis a steam shovel, jointed dolls, and toy carts; Jonathan Woodbury, a sweep horse-power machine; L. T. Guernsey, improvements in a printing press; Herbert Warren, improved gravel roofing; F. B. Gilman, the Gilman lathe; W. L.

Bryant, the Bryant chucking grinder; F. I. Weatherhead, a harness check-hook. James Hartness was granted his first patent when twenty years of age, and he secured over 100 patents during his life time. I have mentioned only a few of these early Springfield artisans, but sufficient to justify Springfield in claiming her title of "The Cradle of Industry."

In 1796, there came to Brandon, one John Conant, of Ashburnham, Mass. He bought a one-half interest in the mills and water-power in the village of Brandon for $930. A few years later he purchased the entire water-power, and in 1816 built a stone grist mill at the head of the lower falls.

All the stoves used in Vermont were supplied by a Troy, N. Y., concern, who had their stoves cast in Philadelphia.

In 1819, Conant made the first Conant cook-stove, the first cook-stove made in Vermont. This was a stove with an oven and boiler. In 1820, Conant erected furnaces, and made his castings from Brandon brown hematite ore. Traces of his furnaces may still be seen outside Forestdale village, on the Rochester road.

Back in the dim, unrecorded ages, an ingenious soul invented the steelyard, a form of balance, so the dictionary says, "to which the body to be weighed is suspended from the shorter arm of a lever, which turns on a fulcrum, and a counter poise is caused to slide upon the longer arm to produce equilibrium, its place upon the arm (which is notched or graduated) indicating the weight." This was the scale, or balance, used by men of all ages, up to 1830.

In 1815, Major Joseph Fairbanks came from Brimfield, Mass., to St. Johnsbury, and started a saw and grist mill on Sleeper's River. With him came his three sons, Erastus, Joseph, and Thaddeus. They operated a small wheelwright shop and a foundry, and made anything that the neighbors wanted—plows, stoves, and farm tools. Thaddeus wanted to weigh a loaded cart, and from his contraption of chains dropping from a steelyard and grappling the axles he evolved the platform scale. He received his first patent June 13, 1831. Before his death in 1886 he had had thirty-two patents on improvements in scales granted him.

Thaddeus Fairbanks was not the only person who had scales on his brain. Up in the little town of Waterford, in 1834, the brothers Elias and Asa Hubbard patented a three-point suspension scale—the basic principle which is used for all heavy-weight scales. The Hubbard brothers also patented the counter scale with detachable scoop.

Both these patents the Hubbards sold to Thaddeus Fairbanks in 1840.

The first Fairbanks manufacturing plant was a wooden building 25 x 60 feet and contained the tools for making the scales, the warehouse, and the sales room. From this small beginning, with a capital of $4,000 has grown the E. & T. Fairbanks and Co., of St. Johnsbury, the largest scale plant in the world.

Bishop, who wrote *History of American Manufacturers*, says of Vermont, "Iron ore exists in nearly every variety and in great quantities in several counties, especially those lying along the western base of the Green Mountain range."

In Tinmouth, in Rutland County, there were ten or twelve forges in 1798; an iron mine was opened as early as 1785. A large forge was built in 1791 on Furnace Brook in Pittsford. In 1794, Rutland County contained 14 iron forges, 3 furnaces, and a slitting mill. It was from the Tinmouth furnaces that the National Hydraulic Pump Co. of Windsor secured its iron.

Isaac Tyson, Jr., was born of Quaker parents in Baltimore, October 1, 1792. His father was a wealthy shipowner. Isaac began his career as mate on one of his father's ships. The ship was wrecked on the south coast of France. Young Tyson was rescued, and his return home was arranged by the U. S. Consul. While waiting for a ship, he visited an iron mill. Upon his return home he prospected in the Maryland hills and found a deposit of chromate of iron at Bare Hills. On February 15, 1827, he patented a method of making copperas by smelting copper pyrites and in 1829 began the production of copper at Strafford, Vermont. How he happened to come to Vermont, and the town of Strafford, history does not tell us. Mr. Tyson wandered over the Vermont hills and in the fall of 1835 discovered black oxide in Plymouth.

A Mr. Martin, his mining expert, employed at Strafford, examined the Plymouth region and found not only rich iron beds but also limestone for flux, and acres of timber for charcoal. Mr. Tyson at once purchased hundreds of acres of ore, limestone, and forest lands in Plymouth. In November, 1836, Mr. Tyson, Thomas Emerson, Albert G. Hatch, and Jones Dudley incorporated the "Windsor & Plymouth Ascutney Iron Co." Mr. Emerson was a speculator; and before the iron company got started, Mr. Emerson's speculations caused the failure of the Windsor Bank, and placed Mr. Emerson

in the county jail. The bank failure was a financial disaster to Windsor.

Mr. Tyson opened his iron mill in 1837, a short distance west of what is now the village of Tyson, on the shore of Echo Lake in Plymouth. Another mill was located on Weaver Hill about three miles east of Tyson village. The usual charge of the furnace was 12 bushels of charcoal, about 1200 lbs. of iron ore, and 200 lbs. of limestone. The ore contained about 50 per cent iron, and burning 100 bushels of charcoal produced one ton of iron.

The workmen at the furnace were a mixed lot. French woodchoppers from upper Canada, charcoal burners from Germany, Irishmen from everywhere, and Negroes. The largest number were the Irish, and the remains of their settlement is still called "Dublin" by the natives of Plymouth. The ordinary workman received $14 to $18 per month, the moulders $1.25 to $1.50 per day, the foreman, $500 per year. In the year 1840, 600 tons of iron were produced at Tyson and sold at $35 per ton. A foundry was also operated and casting sold at 4 to 5 cents per pound.

Mr. Tyson operated the business until 1855 when he retired and died in November, 1861. The works were idle until 1864 when they were started again by a Boston corporation. This new company furnished the iron used in building the U. S. "Monitor." During the latter days of the Civil War the Tyson iron sold for as high as $100 a ton. When Pennsylvania and Alabama iron and coal fields were opened, the Tyson iron fell in price to $20 per ton, and the iron industry of Vermont became only a memory. To-day on the site of the furnace is a steam-power sawmill, the only Tyson industry, a few decaying buildings in "Dublin," and mines hidden by small trees and bushes.

Let him with an exploring mind turn at Echo Lake Inn, owned by Mr. and Mrs. Frank Bacon, and go up the Nineveh road, past the schoolhouse on the right. When he comes to a stone culvert over a small brook on left side of road, he will find a path that will lead him to the old mines. If he returns by the highway, he will see on the flat to his right the location of the since forgotten village of Dublin, where lived, in the prosperous days of the industry, 175 employees of the company. Located on the brook above the schoolhouse was an up-and-down sawmill where was sawed the lumber used for the construction of the buildings. Opposite and east of the schoolhouse one can see the walls and furnace foundations of the top

house and blast furnace. Here also is a pile of quartz used as flux in the furnace, and one can pick up samples of the ore, broken ready for the charge.

The few remaining old houses were built by Isaac Tyson, Jr., also the foundry and other buildings, but the exact location of the foundry is in doubt. Power for the bellows at the furnace was obtained from an overshot water wheel 32 ft. in diameter. The bellows made a dismal groaning sound and reverberating from the hills across the lake gave the lake its name—Echo Lake.

Many of the workmen lived in little huts covered with earth, made warm and comfortable. Their work was hard and long hours as the kilns had to be watched and fed both night and day. The only substantial evidence of past activity is the Congregational Church in Tyson village. The first money paid for its foundation was $100 given by James Tyson, son of Isaac, Jr.

The Echo Lake Inn is well worth a visit. For over 150 years it has cared for the travelling public. From the days of the cattle drovers, and later the iron buyers, to the vacationers of to-day. Its old walls, sturdy construction, and antiques will delight the visitor.

In many other things Vermont has taken the lead. The first copper coins were minted by Reuben Harmon, Jr., of Rupert, in 1785, under an exclusive right of coining copper in Vermont, which right was by act of the Representatives of the freemen of the State of Vermont in General Assembly met, and by authority of the same, held at Norwich June 15, 1785. "All coppers by Harmon coined, shall be in pieces of one-third of an ounce, Troy weight each, and devices and mottoes shall be agreed upon, by the Committee appointed for the purpose by this Assembly."

Harmon constructed a small workshop, that, by courtesy, we will call a mint, in the northeastern part of Rupert, on a small stream, called Mill Brook, a tributary of the Mettawee River. This building was 16 x 18 ft., made of rough, unplaned and unpainted boards, sawed by an up-and-down saw. Here Harmon made about 30 coins per minute.

The device on the coin—on the obverse—was a sun rising, with mountains and trees in the foreground, and a plow in the field beneath, also the words, *Vermont ensium, Res Publica,* and the date. On the reverse there was a radiate eye, surrounded by thirteen stars, also the words, *Quarta Decime Stella,* in English, "The Republic

of the Green Mountains, the fourteenth star." The coins were legal tender for one cent, and 1,000 lbs. of copper made 50,000 coins.

James Wilson of Bradford, in 1799, completed the first artificial globe made in America.

One day in 1814, Silas Hawes sat in front of his blacksmith shop in the village of South Shaftsbury. A peddler drove up and wanted his horse shod. The peddler had no money, so Hawes accepted some worn-out saws for his labor. Then Silas Hawes tried a scheme. He welded two thin pieces of the saw steel together to form a square, and the first steel carpenter's square was made. They still make them at the Eagle Square Manufacturing Co.'s plant in South Shaftsbury.

Hiram Kimball of Stockbridge invented the saw for cutting marble; Otto Ulrichson, the marble planes.

Jeremiah Hall of Middlebury, in 1806, originated the circular saw, but failed to secure a patent. Mr. Crane in his *Let Me Show You Vermont* has another version. He says Tabitha Babbitt, a Shakeress of Massachusetts, made the first circular saw in 1803, three years before Jeremiah Hall.

The Estey Organ Co. was founded by Jacob Estey when thirteen years old with a capital of twenty-five cents. That sum was given him as a consolation prize at a spelling bee. Estey was born in Hinsdale, N. H., in 1814. When twenty years old, he came to Brattleboro and started a plumbing shop. In 1846, Samuel Jones and his brother Joseph, started a business making melodeons. They took in John Woodbury, Riley Burdett, and Asa Field. Burdett wanted to go to California with the "forty-niners," so Jacob Estey bought him out. The shop was burned in 1857. It was rebuilt on the opposite side of the street, and burned again in 1864. It was rebuilt, and again destroyed by the great flood of 1869. Jacob Estey's son-in-law, Levi K. Fuller, later a governor of Vermont, was taken into the business. A new plant was built in 1870. In 1890, 1200 organs a month were built. In July, 1892, when the 250,000th organ was completed, the event was celebrated, and Brattleboro's prima donna, Mary Howe, sang to the accompanying music of that 250,000th Estey organ.

In 1856, January 15, a patent was issued to F. M. Strong, of Vergennes, and Thomas Ross, for a weighing machine, and in 1857 Strong and Ross began the manufacture of scales under their patent at Brandon. In 1857, Strong and Ross made a scale for the Morris Canal Co., of Washington, N. J., a scale with a capacity of 200 tons,

and a platform 70 ft. long, with one end 7 ft. higher than the other, used in weighing canal boats. In 1864, the company failed and the property, consisting of eleven acres in the center of Brandon village was sold at auction to Nathan T. Sprague. Mr. Sprague reorganized the company and continued the business, employing in 1874, 250 men. In 1876, the business outgrew its quarters in Brandon. John B. Page became president and moved the plant to Rutland. Upon the death of Mr. Page, a governor of Vermont, John A. Mead became president. The Howe Scale Co. covers 22 acres, employs 700 men, has branch warehouses in 16 cities, and is capitalized at $2,000,000.

The largest industrial corporation in Vermont began its activities when, in 1836, Willard Humphrey and his brother Moses began quarrying marble near the Humphrey homestead at Sutherland Falls. A number of different companies were organized between the years 1836 and 1867. The last concern, the Sutherland Falls Marble Co., made an assignment in 1869, and Redfield Proctor came into the picture, as receiver. In 1880, the Vermont Marble Co. was organized with Redfield Proctor as its President.

Its activities have been extensive—75 quarries, 1,000,000 cubic feet of finished marble per year, mills and plants at Proctor, Center Rutland, West Rutland, Florence, Brandon, Middlebury, Swanton, Roxbury, Danby, Dorset, Manchester (eleven Vermont towns), and Bluff Point, N. Y., San Saba, Texas, Tokeen, Alaska, and branches in all the large cities (and fifty salesmen on the road).

The Rev. John A. Dodge of Monkton, in 1818, invented and constructed the first sewing machine. He never attempted to manufacture it because of the opposition of journeymen tailors, and because, as a pastor, his time was not his own.

The first postage stamp used in America was made in Brattleboro in 1846. Only *one* uncancelled Brattleboro stamp is known to be in existence, and its value is a small fortune.

I would be lacking in respect, if I failed to mention those two truly great Vermont thinkers—Samuel Morey and Thomas Davenport. Samuel Morey, in 1793, long before Fulton launched his "Clermont," operated his steamboat on the Connecticut River, and later, disappointed and discouraged, sank his boat beneath the waters of Lake Morey. Thomas Davenport, fifty-nine years after his death, was recognized by the plain monument erected to his memory, at Forestdale, marked 1802-1851, as the inventor of the electric motor.

His invention helped more than any other invention to advance America's progress.

Vermont is small in acreage, small in population, only about 9,000 square miles with 360,000 people, yet she leads her sister states in the production of marble, granite, talc, slate, and asbestos. She has many small industries, and some have a national reputation. A. N. Wetherbee of Lyndon makes spinning tops for all the world. Washington County makes the spring clothespins for the Monday wash; Fred Smith, at Moscow, the parcel handles for milady's shopping tour. Winooski supplies the world with screen doors and screens for windows. Waterbury makes the scythe snaths, and East Highgate the scythes. Up in the little town of Wheelock, L. N. Cree makes flexible steel tubing.

One day in 1890, J. T. Shepley rode from Newport to Sheldon on a bicycle, looking for a site for a pulp mill. He found a mill-site at Sheldon Springs, a drop of 75 feet in a distance of 300 feet. Here Shepley built his pulp mill. In 1912, the mill was incorporated as the Missisquoi Pulp and Paper Co. and started making Bristol board at the rate of 7,000 tons per year. In 1925, it increased its output to 15,000 tons per year. It employs 225 men for 24 hours daily, and up to 1929 had never shut down for lack of orders.

Do you know that E. B. and E. C. Whiting Co. of Burlington is the largest manufacturer of Tampico and fibre brushes in the world; that the Bradley Corporation of Brattleboro makes penholders by the million; that the Batchelder Plant of the American Fork and Hoe Co. at Wallingford ships garden tools to nearly every civilized country on the globe; that the Newton-Thompson Co. makes more wooden toys than any one other small-wood toy concern in New England; that the Gilman Paper Co., generates 8,600 H.P. and that the daily output of the mill is four carloads of paper bags each working day; that down in Readsboro the Readsboro Chair Co. has for a number of years furnished the deck chairs and settees for the Cunard Lines?

May I mention other inventors and industrialists whose boyhood days were spent in Vermont?

Ezra Eddy, born in Bristol, the "Match King" of Canada.

William Wallace Chandler of Randolph, inventor of the refrigerator car.

Jefferson Chase of Concord made the first pails and tubs from wood pulp.

William B. Clapp of Montgomery, first man in America to can meat.

John Heman Converse of Burlington, head of the Baldwin Locomotive Works.

Charles Henry Deere of Derby made the first steel plow.

The following sketch of Charles Henry Deere was written by Stella Burke May and appeared in an issue of *American Agriculturist.*

With rifle, ax and plow the pioneers began the development of America. Where game was plentiful or Indians hostile, they used the rifle; in wooded country, the ax. But out in Illinois, when John Deere arrived in 1836 wood was scarce and Indian warfare just ended. The plow was indispensable. It wasn't the iron plow that broke the gravelly soil of New England and which settlers carried West with them. The iron plow had worked fairly well in virgin prairies where thick sod held the sod together, permitting a clean furrow. But after ground had been plowed once and the sod broken, the moist sticky loam of the Middle West clung to the iron plow and rolled itself into mud mountains. Not even two teams of oxen could draw a clean furrow. Farmers were desperate. A better plow was needed. John Deere made one: a steel plow that broke the prairies and opened up the bread basket of the world. "I cut the teeth off a mill saw with a hand chisel," he said. "I heated the steel on the forge, a little at a time, shaping it as best I could." That—in brief—is the story of America's first steel plow.

John Deere was a blacksmith. Back in Middlebury, Vermont, where he had passed his boyhood and served his apprenticeship, he had made shovels and hayforks, iron rims for wagon and stagecoach wheels.

Vermont had emerged from the ax and the rifle stage. Vermonters were going "out West" to seek new fortunes. One Vermonter, Leonard Andrus, an ex-Army major, had gone to Illinois in 1834 and settled on the high-wooded banks above a horseshoe bend in Rock River. Grand Detour was its name. Andrus built a sawmill and prospered. He returned to Vermont and persuaded some relatives and friends to go West with him, among them his father-in-law, Amos Bosworth, who owned a stagecoach and freighting business and for whom John Deere had worked. Deere joined them, leaving his wife to follow later with their children, and arrived in Grand Detour with his blacksmith's tools wrapped in a leather apron, and $73.73 in his pockets. He was six feet tall, with muscles of iron. His blue eyes looked out upon a world that rolled westward to the setting sun. The prairie wind ruffled his wavy hair. He was thirty-two years old. He built a forge with stones from Rock River, using clay for mortar. With that finished he was ready for customers. Farmers from miles around with broken tools came to his forge. Plows predominated—iron plows broken by the pull of the team in the heavy loam. Yes, the settlers needed a better plow—of that the blacksmith was sure. A plow that would scour through the sticky mud leaving a clean furrow for planting. One day, visiting Leonard Andrus's sawmill, Deere noticed a broken circular saw blade made of Sheffield steel. The steel shone like a mirror.

Carrying the broken saw back to his forge, Deere cut off the teeth with a hand chisel; made a paper pattern of a moldboard and share and with chisel cut the steel to pattern, heating it at the forge and shaping it with a wooden mallet to prevent denting. Upright standards of bar iron; a sapling with roots bent for a handle; a piece of fence rail for a beam—and America's first steel plow was ready for trial. It was a self-scouring plow, strong enough to endure in heavy soil but light enough to be carried on a man's shoulder. With Lewis Crandall's horse to pull it and Crandall's heavy bottom land to test it, John Deere gave his plow a trial. The steel share pierced the soil. The steel moldboard curled back the heavy loam, leaving a clean furrow. When the field was plowed, share and moldboard were bright and shining as ever. It polished itself! John Deere built a five-room house and sent for his wife and five children, the youngest born since he left Vermont. That first year he sold one plow; the next year three; the year after ten; and all the time he carried on his blacksmith's trade. By 1842 he was selling two plows a week. He and Andrus entered into partnership and built a brick factory. In 1846 the partnership was dissolved, and Deere moved his plant to Moline, where his product was carried by river steamer when navigation was open, by wagon routes when it was closed. When John Deere died, in May, 1856, his son Charles, born in Vermont while his father was pioneering in Illinois, took over the business. But until his last days, Deere, Sr., never forsook his forge.

The little white cottage where John Deere welcomed his family from Vermont still stands. A monument to the past, its windows look out across a nation transformed by the man who beat a saw into a plowshare.

William Harvey, born in Wardsboro, made the first gimlet pointed screw; Charles Ira Hood of Chelsea was the originator of "patent medicine"; Graves Elisha Otis of Halifax invented the Otis elevator; Lysander Rice of Windsor invented the roller process for making flour; James Sargent of Chester was inventor of the first successful time lock; Philo P. Stewart of Pawlet, the horse rake; John T. Winslow of Bennington invented the "Monitor," the first iron clad ship; Joseph S. Mott of Alburg, the first wood-planing machine; Isaac Fischer, Jr., of Springfield was the inventor of sandpaper. Pages could be written regarding the growth and development of the marble, granite, slate, talc, copper, and asbestos industries in our state.

Vermont has an interest in the Byrd Antarctic Expedition as the dyes used in coloring the tents and flags are made by the Wells and Richardson Co., Inc., of Burlington. Orange and black colors have the greatest visibility and prominence against ice glare. From a plane orange stands out better against snow than any other color.

Vermonters have always been industrious, inventive workers. In the days prior to the Civil War, they, of necessity, depended upon

their own initiative for the requirements of their lives. The small industry was, and is to-day, the symbol of progress.

Vermont will probably never be a leading industrial state. In material wealth she is the poorest state in New England. It is said that Vermont towns have no future. But to-day there is *no cheap* land in the West to lure Vermont's sons and daughters to the virgin soil of the prairies. Here in Vermont is the opportunity of the future. The green hills and valleys of Vermont must play an ever growing part in her progress. Vermont is still the mother of men, and in the years to come, as in the past, the millions in our smoke-stained cities will look for clear-eyed thinkers to Vermont's everlasting hills.

There are tales about Vermont
In history and in song.
Some have been written rightly,
And others written wrong.

I leave this paper for you to judge! If you question statements made—then I must refer you to authorities I have consulted.

[Mr. Putnam lists among his authorities and references, Hemenway, Zadock Thompson, Arthur F. Stone, Walter H. Crockett, Charles E. Crane, Edward Conant, Guy Hubbard. Editor.]

THE RISE AND DECLINE OF THE IRON INDUSTRY IN THE EASTERN ADIRONDACK REGION

By Elmer Eugene Barker, Ph.D.

Doctor Barker was one of the principal speakers at the Second Conference of Lake Champlain Historians on June 29, 1940, at Basin Harbor, Vermont. The abstract of his address was received too late for inclusion in the issue of the Proceedings [*September, Vol. VIII, No. 3*] *in which we published synopses and abstracts of the addresses given. We listened to his scholarly address with envy, for the story of the iron industry in Vermont is yet to be told, and we know it is a story that merits telling. Some Vermont historian with an understanding of the value of economic history will find the tale of the rise and decline of the iron industry in Vermont as fascinating a story of human endeavor as can be found in the state. Doctor Barker points the way in this excerpt from the letter accompanying his manuscript: "The men who initiated and developed the iron industry at Crown Point were all from Pittsford, Vermont. I have little doubt that they knew, more or less, about what they were doing when they started it, as there was, I believe, a furnace at Pittsford, and others also in that vicinity." Editor.*

IRON is as indispensable in a primitive community as it is in one highly developed. For this reason the American pioneers eagerly sought ore, and the early settlers exploited deposits to supply a lucrative demand.

In the Adirondack region there is record of iron being mined as early as 1766 by Major Philip Skene. He used it in forges at his settlement, Skenesboro, now Whitehall. Iron from this mine was used in fitting out ships used in the War of the Revolution. In 1801, the deposit at Arnold Hill in Peru, Clinton County, was discovered. The Elba Iron Works in Essex County was established in 1809.

During this earlier period the development of an iron industry was held back by lack of transportation and markets wider than the local communities. The opening of the Champlain Canal in 1820 afforded

means of continuous transportation from Lake Champlain to the Hudson River with its large markets. This gave great stimulus to the exploitation of the iron deposits of this region. In 1818, the Saxe bed near Crown Point Center in Essex County was discovered, and ore from it was used three years later in a forge not far distant. After the Penfield bed in the town of Crown Point was discovered in 1821 ore from that source was used in the forge. The Hammond bed, one half mile from the Penfield bed, was discovered in 1826 and was operated continuously for nearly seventy years. The Chateaugay deposits at Iron Mountain in Clinton County were discovered in 1823 and the famous mines at Mineville in the town of Moriah, Essex County, were opened about 1824. At the present time these mines are producing greater amounts of ore than at any previous time in their history.

An iron industry could not have been developed in those times based on iron ore alone. Other materials were essential. Wood was needed in unlimited quantities for supplying the fires of the forges and furnaces and to a less degree for shoring the mines; limestone to form a flux with the ore in the process of smelting in the furnace. Forges had to be located on streams where sufficient water power was available to operate the triphammers and other machinery. Further, a live and constant market had to be within reach. All these necessities were present in the eastern Adirondack region after the first quarter of the nineteenth century. The supply of wood early became depleted, so that by 1850 furnaces along the shores of Lake Champlain were largely using anthracite coal which could be shipped by canal, river, and lake, directly from the mines (after a short initial haul by rail). After a railroad was completed up the west side of the lake to Plattsburg in 1875, a supply of coal was available all the year and also marble from the Vermont quarries for flux.

Early methods of separating iron from its rock impurities were (1) by roasting, crushing, and washing with a strong current of water, and (2) the magnetic process in which crushed ore was shovelled into a revolving cylinder to which magnets were attached. The particles of iron adhered to these magnets and were swept off by stationary brushes and collected. Such machines were in use at the Peru Iron Works in Clinton County and at Crown Point in Essex County, in the Penfield & Harwood Iron Works. Here an electromagnet used to recharge the separator magnets is said to have been the first industrial use anywhere of electricity.

The process of making bloom ("charcoal") iron in the Catalan forge was described. Some twenty-five forges of this type were in operation in this region in the early 1870's. The process of making pig iron in the blast furnace was described.

In the 1880's about twenty-three per cent of the iron ore produced in the United States was from this region, but in the 1890's vast deposits of excellent ore were discovered and developed in Minnesota and Wisconsin. These deposits could be mined so inexpensively and shipped so conveniently to the coal regions that this source became a fatal rival to the Adirondack deposits. This competition together with the severe industrial depression of that decade caused the downfall of the iron industry in northern New York.

POSTSCRIPT

WHAT do we mean by the term "democracy"? I suggested in the Postscript of the September issue that the variance in definitions among Americans is somewhat startling, believing that any idea that is dimly grasped can never function clearly in action. I asked readers who were interested to send me their personal definitions, those not secured by immediate reference to some text. So many replies came in that I find I cannot keep my implied promise to print them, but I am selecting a few which seem representative. Mr. George P. Anderson writes from Boston: "Without any dictionary and without consulting any book, my definition of 'democracy' follows: Democracy is a civic condition in which people live under a system of law, adopted voluntarily by themselves, which gives equal rights and opportunities to all, and imposes equal obligations upon all." Mr. Vincent A. Alden of Montpelier says that his immediate definition is "Equality of rights in government." He adds that "Just how much equality remains in our democracy is a subject worthy of intense discussion," and it is his belief that "America remains the last stronghold of equality of rights in representative government, and even at that, it is not too strong." H. J. Conant, state librarian, expanded his definition into an analysis that seems worthy of being recorded in full:

"To most people democracy means the kind of government that we enjoy in the United States. As Jefferson expressed it in the Declaration of Independence, it is a government that recognizes the equality of man and secures to him the rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. It is a government 'of the people, by the people and for the people.'

"It enables man to enjoy, as much as is consistent with the similar enjoyment by others, the love of freedom that is common to all mankind. It seeks to attain the greatest good for the greatest number by vesting the political power in the majority under a constitution that safeguards civil liberties.

"It is the clue to the progress of civilization which is the story of man's efforts to satisfy his yearnings for freedom and justice and become master of his own destiny.

"Mussolini says democracy is a 'rotten corpse,' but de Tocqueville said he could not help but feel a religious dread as he contemplated the power and attainments of democracy through the years. It struck off one by one the shackles that rulers have attempted to place on mankind. It destroyed the feudal system and brought about the Reformation. It curbed the power of the church and stripped it of its vast holdings of land. It overthrew kings, czars and dictators, and will continue to do so in the future. It gave to men and women the suffrage by which they have the power to control their government.

"It is a vital force that is stronger today than ever before. It is awakening the heretofore inarticulate masses in China and India to a love of freedom and desire for independence. It enables man to realize his hopes for a better social order. In the words of Winston Churchill 'Long live the forward march of the common people in all the lands toward their just and true inheritance and toward the broader and fuller age.' "

America is a slogan-loving land, and perhaps in the next few years in which democracy is facing its great test, some genius of a phrase-maker will be inspired to create a line in defining democracy that will be a line of fire and flame and light the minds of all who have faith in, even as they admit and long to control the weaknesses of, democracy.

* * * * *

The question of the true birthplace of President Arthur came very much alive as a result of the printing of Mrs. Westcot's letter in our last issue. John Spargo of Bennington, a veteran with many years' experience in untangling the mixed conclusions of men, wrote us immediately, and we found the letter so pertinent and suggestive that we are publishing it herewith:

I have read, with much interest, Mrs. Westcot's letter in which she raises anew the old question of the correctness or otherwise of the accepted belief that Chester A. Arthur was born at Fairfield. Perhaps this publication will inspire some patient researcher to delve into the whole matter—for the issue is much wider and more serious than Mrs. Westcot indicates.

Some two or three years ago, in a speech, I suggested that it is not only possible, but even probable, that Calvin Coolidge was the only Vermont born President; that Chester A. Arthur was not born in

Vermont, as generally believed, nor, for that matter, in the United States.

I purposely dragged this subject into the address that I made in the hope that it might attract attention enough to result in discussion and, especially, serious effort on the part of some younger students of our history to clear up a matter that has been in dispute at least since 1884, when A. P. Hinman published his little book, "How a British Subject Became President of the United States." The aim of this little book, now quite scarce and rare, was to prove that Chester Alan Arthur was actually born in Canada. A copy of this small volume lies before me as I write this letter.

While the evidence presented cannot be regarded as being conclusive, it does throw a cloud of substantial doubt upon the accepted account. There are people living now in and around Stanbridge, P. Q., whose stories, derived from their parents and grandparents, support the Hinman claim. Less than two years ago, a distinguished historical student from that neighborhood visited me here and told me that the stories current in his family during his youth conformed to the account of Arthur's parentage and birth given by Hinman.

Even though Hinman was, obviously, a political foe with a personal grudge against Arthur, I have long felt that his contention was probably sound, in the main. It is fairly well-known by students that in 1880, when Arthur was nominated for the vice-presidency, his friends worked desperately to hush up the charge that he was born across the line, in Canada. There is good reason to believe that they caused the removal from the records of Fairfield of certain birth records that would have supported Hinman's contention.

Chester A. Arthur's Irish-born father, William Arthur, by turns schoolmaster and minister, lived at Stanbridge and at Dunham Flats, some seven miles distant. In the latter place lived a Methodist parson named George Washington Stone, whose daughter, Melvina, Arthur married. The two are said to have gone across the border to East Berkshire, and to have returned with the statement that they had been married there. Owing, it is said, to the fact that some disbelief in the hasty runaway marriage was expressed by the lady's family, there was a second marriage ceremony performed by the Episcopal minister, the Rev. Mr. Cotton. This marriage is of record.

In 1823 William Arthur and his wife moved to Burlington, Vermont, where he, William, entered a lawyer's office as clerk, his intention then being to take up the practice of law. In Burlington,

on March 14, 1824, a child was born, a girl, named Jane, who in time became Mrs. Marston, of Cohoes, N. Y. Late in 1825 the family moved to Jericho, where on January 22, 1826, a second daughter, Almeda, was born. That Spring they moved to Richford, just on the Canadian line. In 1827 the family moved to Waterville, Vermont. They lived there until May, 1828, when the family moved again, this time to Fairfield. In the interval, in January, 1828, Mrs. Arthur gave birth to her first son. But this event did not take place at her own home, in Waterville. Instead, it took place at the home of Mrs. Arthur's parents, at Dunham, P. Q. The boy was named William, after his father.

According to the Hinman charge, it was this boy who later became President of the United States. For a large part of his life, it is said, Chester Alan Arthur, so-called, never made any claim to Fairfield as a birthplace. The statement was never challenged that he was an American citizen (son of an American citizen by naturalization) who just chanced to have been born in Canada, at his grandparents' home. But when he was being groomed as a vice-presidential possibility, it was desirable to get rid of that accidental and awkward fact of birth outside the United States, if possible.

Now, in 1880, there were several people living in and around Stanbridge and Dunham who remembered the return of Mrs. Arthur, from Waterville, to her parents' home and the birth there of her first male child. And some of them remembered seeing the child grow up to school age.

I think you will note that the dates given fit in with Mrs. Westcot's story. There was an infant son while the family lived at Waterville, prior to the removal to Fairfield. The child was born during the Waterville residence and if credited at all to a Vermont town should have been credited to Waterville, not Fairfield. But a child is born —where it is born. A child born to American parents (even if these be native-born citizens of the United States) outside of the U. S. (otherwise than on an American ship or in such places as American embassies, these being, technically, United States territory) is not a "natural-born citizen of the United States" within the accepted meaning of the Constitution.

Now, a child was born to the Arthurs at North Fairfield, Vt., November, 1830. That child, a boy, was christened "Chester Abell *Arthur," after Dr. Chester Abell, a well-known local character and crony of William Arthur, the child's father. This child died in*

Burlington, the following Summer, while Mrs. Arthur was visiting friends there, her husband being employed teaching in Canada at the time.

When in after years it was necessary to set up some sort of "proof" that the ambitious politician was entitled to be elected vice-president (or president) the birth of the male child at Fairfield was made to serve.

So much for the general outline of the story. Hinman's little book is not conclusive. At best it might sustain a verdict of "Not Proven," in the Scotch manner. But I have felt for a good many years that careful research along the lines of Hinman's leads would bear interesting fruit—even at this late date.

Another veteran in research, George P. Anderson of 25 Cumberland St., Boston, Mass., sends a few comments that may help some student who wishes to solve the puzzle:

May I barge into the discussion of the birthplace of Chester Alan Arthur, with some evidence that is, perhaps, only hearsay, and yet may be of some importance? In my boyhood, say from 1880 to 1892, I spent much of each summer on my grandfather's farm in East Fairfield. My grandfather, John Nelson Pomeroy, was born in 1820 and was much interested in history; and I have heard him say many times that Chester A. Arthur was born in Fairfield, only a few miles from his place; and he likewise pointed out to me, a loghouse at Fairfield Center, which he said for a short time was occupied by Rev. Arthur's family, who soon moved from town and settled in New York state, in some small town, across (westward) Lake Champlain. This loghouse stood just beyond a covered bridge, on the left, if one is driving from St. Albans to Fairfield, right on the main road. If it is still standing (which I doubt, although it was a large timbered structure, and well jointed) it must be well known. The first place I mentioned was in a desolate section of the town with few habitations near. It was to this spot that the people who erected a monument to Arthur, went about thirty or thirty-five years ago. I can't recall the exact date, but it can easily be learned. I was one of those present at the dedication exercises; and I recall definitely the place where the monument was erected. It was beside a cellar, which we were told was all that remained to mark the spot where the Arthur dwelling stood. Now, they don't usually have cellars under barns, and this was a well-walled cellar, one that had been

under a large house. That does not fit into the story of a barn that was being fixed over for the Arthurs. The time the Arthur family was in Fairfield was quite short, and I doubt if they lived in three places in that short time, assuming that my grandfather was right when he pointed out that loghouse (with a regulation wooden roof) to me, and said that that was where Arthur lived when he was a baby. I hesitate to discuss the accuracy of Mrs. Westcot's story, but if it is as she relates, why was there ever any concealment of the fact that Chester A. Arthur was born in Waterville? What motive could there be for ignoring his actual birthplace?

The story of Arthur's possible birthplace being in Canada injects a second doubtful theory, and it should be noted that Enosburg Falls where Dr. Chester Abell lived is almost as near to Canada, as it is to Fairfield.

I suggest that a careful examination of the records of Fairfield ought to be made, to see whether Arthur's birth is recorded and under what date, and also whether there is any entry in Waterville. Often at that period births went unrecorded, but an educated minister would be rather apt to have attended to the recording of the birth of his first-born son.

* * * * *

The attention being drawn to the Lake Champlain region in these recent years will undoubtedly have useful historical and economic results. The First Conference of Lake Champlain Historians cleared the way and opened the prospect for some united studies of the region on the part of Vermont and New York. We may see possibly even a modern revival of extensive trading between Vermont and New York across the lake. A comment by Doctor Barker is worth noting here:

"I heartily endorse what you say about the desirability of studying the history of the Lake region as a whole—not only from the New York or the Vermont point of view; its Canadian relations also should be considered. The Valley is a regional unit in itself and boundaries of political units in that locality are very arbitrary indeed when it comes to considering common problems relating to the whole area. Not only should its history be studied as a whole, but present-day studies of economic and social problems and planning for the future also should be on a regional basis. I trust you will get an

enthusiastic response when you invite the Canadians to join us in our studies."

* * * * *

In the face of a great deal of lip-service paid to the theme of interesting Vermont boys and girls in Vermont, the Edmunds Memorial Essay Contest goes on its quiet annual way, giving Vermont youth a chance to find in Vermont history in all its phases something in the way of a faith in Vermont and its leaders. I had already decided to publish Mr. Fenton's address on Seth Warner, but if I had had any doubt, this earnest letter from a lad who entered the Edmunds Contest of last year would have helped me to a decision. His letter comes to me from the Y.M.C.A. Hotel, 826 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill. His name is Carmine A. Pacca, and he writes as follows:

I am a young and loyal Vermonter in Chicago, attending an Army Air Corps Aeronautical School. I have written to Senator Warren R. Austin pertaining to the issuing of a commemorative stamp of Ethan and Ira Allen, and he has referred me to you. So now I ask you, in the name of Vermont and in respect and appreciation for Vermont's greatest military leader, to please consider Seth Warner. Needless to say, he was a great man. He fought gallantly at the battles of Hubbardton and Bennington, led the Green Mountain Boys in an invasion of Canada, was the captor of Crown Point. I think that his memory deserves to be enshrined in the hearts of every Vermonter. I do not wish to belittle Ethan Allen in any respect, but historians say that Seth Warner was one of Vermont's greatest military leaders, and was chosen above Ethan Allen to lead the Green Mountain Boys in the invasion of Canada. If you desire further proof of my sincerity, please refer back to this year's essay contest conducted by the Vermont Historical Society. You will find my essay with the theme centered about Seth Warner among them. I love Vermont, and if it were in my power, I would do everything possible for the remembrance of Vermont's greatest hero, Seth Warner. I may be insignificant and unknown to Vermont, but I know and love the heroes that made it great.

* * * * *

The plans for Vermont's sesquicentennial celebration of the admission of Vermont into the Union in 1791 have moved toward

definite objectives under the guidance of the Citizens Sesquicentennial Committee. The celebration will run practically through the year, beginning with the town-meeting day, March 4, 1941. On this day nearly every town in the state will make use of its town-meeting to stage some form of a celebration as it happens that Vermont was admitted to the Union on March 4, 1791. The theme of the celebration will be "Democracy in Action." Celebrations by towns, cities, and various organizations will be staggered through the summer; a calendar will be issued; and it will be possible for summer visitors to witness and take part in the celebrations. The closing state-wide celebration is planned for the autumn; at this celebration it is hoped to have the governors of the original thirteen states to form the Union present, also the President of the United States. The thought in the mind of the committee is to make the celebration expressive of the spirit of democracy and stage it through means that will have not only a local and national, but possibly an international significance. A project to purchase a fighting plane and offer it to the British Government has been one of the suggestions with an international viewpoint. Readers of the *Proceedings* who wish to follow the plans for the year will receive full information by sending their names and addresses to the secretary of the committee, James P. Taylor, Vermont State Chamber of Commerce, Burlington, Vermont. Those interested will receive copies of "The Sesqui News," a bulletin to be issued from time to time.

* * * * *

The Society under the leadership of President Gay is entering actively into plans for the sesquicentennial. Since one of the objectives is to interest and give Vermont youth a close contact with the entire celebration and the theme at the heart of it, the Edmunds Memorial Essay Contest will be directed toward the sesquicentennial, and it is expected that every high school in the state will be represented in the contest. The winners of prizes will receive them at the general state meeting in the fall. Professor Leon W. Dean of the University of Vermont has written at the request of the Society a history of the events preceding the admission of the state into the Union. This history will be attractively printed, and, if present plans hold, will be sent free to all libraries of the state and to all members of the Society at a special discount. The Society is planning to preserve all records of the sesquicentennial exercises in each community.

The year 1941 promises to be something in the nature of a year of destiny, and Vermonters of the future will find such records valuable. It seems reasonable to assume that though the altar fires of democracy are burning dimly in many countries and in some states in America, they will flame even more vigorously in this mountain state with its fine traditions and its heritage that free men made possible.

* * * * *

Two most attractive books, *The Valley of the Kedron* by Mary Grace Canfield, and *Yankees and Yorkers* by Dixon Ryan Fox, await the consideration of our reviewers—and this paragraph is a nudge in the direction of the said reviewers.

A. W. P.